

Supplementary Material

Experiments 1 and 2: Passages

Passages and test questions were developed from different books in the “Taking Sides” McGraw-Hill Contemporary Learning Series (www.mhcls.com).

SUPERFUND: Easton, T. A. (Ed.). (2006). *Taking sides: Clashing views on environmental issues* (11th ed.). Dubuque, IA: McGraw-Hill Companies, Inc.

WELFARE: Finsterbusch, K., & McKenna, G. (Eds.). (1984). *Taking sides: Clashing views on controversial social issues* (3rd ed.). Guilford, CT: Dushkin Publishing Group.

BIOTECH: Moseley, W. G. (Ed.). (2007). *Taking sides: Clashing views on African issues* (2nd ed.). Dubuque, IA: McGraw-Hill Companies, Inc.

LINCOLN: Madaras, L., & SoRelle, J. M. (Eds.). (1993). *Taking sides: Clashing views on controversial issues in American history* (5th ed., Volume 1). Guilford, CT: Dushkin Publishing Group.

WOMEN LIBERATION: Madaras, L., & SoRelle, J. M. (Eds.). (1993). *Taking sides: Clashing views on controversial issues in American history* (5th ed., Volume 2). Guilford, CT: Dushkin Publishing Group.

MULTICULTURALISM: Noll, J. W. (Ed.). (2001). *Taking sides: Clashing views on controversial educational issues* (11th ed.). Guilford, CT: Dushkin/McGraw-Hill.

SEX DIFFERENCES: Paul, E. L. (Ed.). (2002). *Taking sides: Clashing views on controversial issues in sex and gender* (2nd ed.). Guilford, CT: McGraw-Hill/Dushkin.

VACCINATION: Daniel, E. L. (Ed.). (2006). *Taking sides: Clashing views in health and society* (7th ed.). Dubuque, IA: McGraw-Hill Companies, Inc.

CONTRAS: Rourke, J. T. (Ed.). (1987). *Taking sides: Clashing views on controversial issues in world politics* (1st ed.). Guilford, CT: Dushkin Publishing Group.

Is the Superfund Program Successfully Protecting the Environment from Hazardous Waste? (Easton, 2006)

YES

Superfund, one of the main programs used by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) to clean up serious, often abandoned, hazardous waste sites, has been improved considerably in recent years. Notably, progress has been made in two important areas: the development of risk assessments that are scientifically valid yet flexible, and the development and implementation of better treatment strategies.

Before 1995, the EPA's assessment of potential public health risks at Superfund sites often assumed future residential use at the site, however unrealistic that scenario might be. This assumption would often result in the need for costly soil and waste removal remedies necessary to protect against hypothetical risks, such as those to children playing in contaminated soil or drinking contaminated ground water, even at sites where future residential use was highly improbable. After 1995, revised land use guidelines provided a basis for selecting more realistic future use scenarios, with projected exposure patterns that may allow for less costly remedies.

Potentially responsible parties also complained that there was little room to tailor remedies to the magnitude of cancer risk at a site, and that the same costly remedies would be chosen for sites where the cancer risks may differ by several orders of magnitude. However, the EPA has now established a risk-based hierarchy for remedy selection. For example, if cancer risks at a site exceed 1 in 1,000 people, then treatment or waste removal or both might be required. Sites that posed a lower lifetime cancer risk could be managed in other ways, such as by prohibiting the installation of drinking water wells, which likely would be far less expensive than intrusive remedies.

Revisions to land use guidelines also refined the EPA's evolving remedy-selection criteria. For example, these revisions require an explicit consideration of the short-term effectiveness of a remedy, including the health and safety risks to the public and to workers associated with remedy implementation. The EPA has learned by experience that ignoring implementation risks, such as those associated with vapor and dust emissions during the excavation of wastes, could lead to the selection of remedies that proved costly and created unacceptable risks.

Cleanup efforts in Superfund's early years were dominated by containment and excavation-and-disposal remedies. But over the years, cooperative work by government, industry, and academia have led to the development and implementation of improved treatment technologies. More recently, there has been a dramatic increase in the use of source control treatment. Two types of source control technologies that have been widely used are incineration and soil vapor extraction. Although the use of incineration decreased during the 1990s because of cost and other factors, soil vapor extraction remains a proven technology at Superfund sites.

In recent years, the rate at which waste sites are being added to the National Priorities List has been decreasing dramatically. From 1983-1991, the EPA placed an average of 135 sites on the list annually. The rate dropped to an average of 27 sites per year between 1992-2001. In 1988, most waste sites were in the investigation stage, and the Superfund program was widely criticized as being too much about studies and not enough about cleanup. Superfund is now a program predominantly focused on the design and construction of cleanup remedies.

NO

The prairie at Tar Creek, in the northeast corner of Oklahoma, is punctured with 480 open mine shafts and 30,000 drill holes. Little League fields have been built over an immense underground cavity that could collapse at any time. Acid mine waste flushes into drinking wells. When the water rises in Tar Creek, a neon-orange scum oozes onto the roadside. Wild onions are saturated with cadmium, which may explain why three different kidney dialysis centers have opened here to serve a population of only 30,000.

It wasn't supposed to be like this. In 1980, Congress passed the "Superfund law," one of the boldest environmental statutes in U.S. history. But today, Superfund is a program under siege, plagued by partisan politics, industry stonewalling, and bureaucratic inertia. According to the General Accounting Office (GAO), 25% of Americans still live within four miles of a Superfund site, many of them are fields saturated with cancer-causing chemicals and other toxins. The GAO reports that the program's budget fell 35% over the past decade. According to the EPA's inspector general, 29 projects in 17 states were underfunded last year. According to a U.S. Senator, the federal administration has "allowed these sites to rot where they are."

Tar Creek is a case in point. Two decades after it was targeted on the very first Superfund priority list, the site is worse off than ever. Early on, the government confined its effort to the polluted creek, without looking at chat piles (the powdery output of mills after ore is extracted from rock), soil, air quality, or the danger of sink holes. Was it a lack of knowledge of the danger, as EPA claims? Or industry influence, as environmentalists charge? Whatever the reason, federal attorneys settled with mining companies for pennies on the dollar. Now, after fruitless efforts to contain 28 billion gallons of acid mine water, contamination is spreading across a vast watershed. And although the EPA trucked out toxic dirt from about 2,000 homes and schools, Tar Creek's children still show elevated lead levels at six times the national average.

At Tar Creek, many residents have given up hope. Even the EPA, which has spent \$107 million at the site, isn't sure if it can ever be repaired. "We don't have an off-the-shelf remedy," says an EPA Superfund official. "What do you do with the enormous chat piles? When does cleanup become impractical? We have limited resources." In a show of no confidence, the Oklahoma legislature passed a \$5 million buyout for all families with children under age 6. The head of the Tar Creek Steering Committee, a group of buyout supporters, veers between cynicism and despair. "They think we're poor white trash," he says bitterly. "The votes here don't affect any federal election, so

why bother? We've agitated till we can't agitate anymore." Meanwhile, at Tar Creek, the toxic dust keeps blowing in the wind.

Was Abraham Lincoln America's Greatest President?
(Madaras & SoRelle, 1993, Vol. 1)

YES

In the flames of civil war, Lincoln underwent seemingly endless crises that might have shattered a weaker man. Here he was – a President who lacked administrative experience, suffered from chronic depression, hated to fire inept subordinates and bungling generals – thrust into the center of a deadly conflict. Here he was, forced to make awesome decisions in a war that had no precedent in all American history, a war without constitutional or political guidelines for him to follow. At the same time, Lincoln had to live with the knowledge that he was the most unpopular President the Republic had known up to that time.

From all directions came cries that Lincoln was unfit to be President, that he was too inexperienced, too inept, too stupid and imbecilic, to reunite the country. Melancholy and inexperienced though he was, Lincoln managed nevertheless to see this huge and confusing conflict in a world dimension. He defined and fought it according to this core of unshakable convictions about America's experiment and historic mission in the progress of human liberty.

Nowhere was the struggle more evident than in the nagging problem of slavery. Recall that what guided Lincoln in the matter of emancipation was his commitment, not just to the Union, but to what it represented and symbolized. Here, as in all war-related issues, Lincoln's devotion to the war's central idea – to preserving a system that guaranteed to all the right of self-government – dictated his course of action.

In 1862, Lincoln called on Congress to adopt an emancipation amendment. In 1864, the Senate adopted it by a vote of 38 to 6, but it failed to muster the required two-thirds majority in the House. After that, Lincoln put tremendous pressure on the House to approve the amendment, using all his powers of persuasion and patronage to get it through. With the outcome much in doubt, Lincoln and congressional Republicans participated in secret negotiations never made public – negotiations that allegedly involved patronage, a New Jersey railroad monopoly, and the release of rebels related to congressional Democrats – to bring wavering opponents into line.

In 1865, the House adopted the present Thirteenth Amendment by just three votes more than the required two-thirds majority. When ratified by the states, the amendment would end human bondage everywhere in America. Lincoln had come a long distance from the harassed political candidate, opposed to emancipation lest his political career be jeopardized, convinced that only the distant future could remove slavery from his troubled land. The Proclamation had indeed liberated Abraham Lincoln, enabling him to act more consistently with his moral convictions. He was, then, a warrior for the American dream, prepared to do whatever was necessary to save it short of abandoning the dream itself. Putting aside his own aversion to bloodshed and violence, Lincoln ended up pounding all his southern foes into submission. And he did so

because that was the surest way he knew to shorten the conflict, end the killing, and salvage his American dream.

NO

Of course, nothing that we can identify as part of Lincoln's legacy belongs to him alone. In some respects, the Emancipator was carried along with the tides. The first and most obvious item in my bill of particulars for indictment concerns Lincoln's dishonesty and obfuscation with respect to the nation's future obligations to the Negro, slave, and free. Lincoln, in insisting that the Negro was included in the promise of the Declaration of Independence, seemed clearly to point toward a radical transformation of American society. But at the same time, he added certain modifications to this high doctrine: modifications required by those of his countrymen to whom he hoped to appeal. It was an essential ingredient of Lincoln's position that he make a success at being anti-Southern or anti-slavery without at the same time appearing to be significantly pro-Negro. Lincoln's commitment was precisely of the sort that the North was ready to make: passing legislation to restrict the flow of Negroes into the North, while exploiting black labor in a conquered South. Lincoln's double talk left the North with a durable tradition of self-congratulation.

The second heading in this "case against Lincoln" has to do with Lincoln's management of the commercial and business life of the part of the Republic under his authority. Military necessity provided an excuse, an umbrella of sanction, under which the essential nature of the changes being made in the relation of government to commerce could be concealed. The inflationary policy of rewarding the friends of the government sustained. The euphemism of our time calls this "income redistribution." But it was theft in 1864, and is theft today. As chief executive, Lincoln supported heavy taxes. The war was a legitimate explanation for these measures. Lincoln's participation in huge subsidies for railroads and in other legislation granting economic favors is not so readily linked to "saving the Union." All of his life, Lincoln was a friend of the big corporations. There can be no doubt of Lincoln's responsibility for the depressing spectacle of greed concerning which so many loyal Northern men of the day spoke with sorrow, disappointment, and outrage.

A large part of the complaint against Lincoln has to do with his expansion of the powers of the presidency. Lincoln believed there were "no limits" to his powers if he exercised them in the name of preserving the Union. Lincoln began his tenure as a dictator when, without interference from Congress, he summoned militia, spent millions, suspended law, authorized recruiting, decreed a blockage, defied the Supreme Court, and pledged the nation's credit. But in my opinion, the capstone of this case against Lincoln is what he had done to the language of American political discourse that makes it so difficult for us to reverse the ill effects of trends he set in motion with his executive power. I am chiefly referring to his habit of wrapping up his policy in the idiom of Holy Scripture, concealing within a Trojan horse the moral superiority of an agenda that would never have been approved if presented in any other form.

Will Biotech Solve Africa's Food Problems? (Moseley, 2007)

YES

Few would disagree that the many claims and counterclaims concerning what biotechnology can or cannot do to solve Africa's food insecurity problem have mainly been made by non-Africans. Although opinions differ regarding the role biotechnology can play in African development, all must agree about the urgency to eradicate the perpetual cycle of hunger, malnutrition, and death in a world of plenty. Since farming is the most important source of income and sustenance for about 75% of the population of Sub-Saharan Africa, there is no doubt that agricultural biotechnology can make very substantial contributions toward increasing food production by rural resource-poor farmers.

In villages, constraints to crop production include pests, diseases, weeds, low fertilizer inputs, poor roads to markets, etc. For some of these constraints, biotech is the most promising recourse to alleviate them. For example, recent research shows that a pest that hinders legume production in Africa can be controlled by applying biotech tools. It is conceivable that the millions of dollars being wasted each year by anti-biotech activists elsewhere could go a long way to help build badly needed capacity for biotech research in Africa. Also, biotech for Africa should mostly be done in Africa and mostly by Africans themselves. And yes, this is being realistic, and it can be done, if there is consensus and goodwill.

A good example of how biotech can reach rural farmers involves a special program where the composition of farmers includes male and female farmers, oxen owners, different age groups from different sub-villages, etc. This program ensures that farmers participate in the research as partners with scientists and other actors, and enables scientists to also utilize indigenous knowledge in research and development. This prevents "cut and paste" approaches that may be foreign market-driven and which tend to provide short-term, quick-fix solutions to unique problems faced by small scale farmers in Africa, who have developed their own unique crops, cropping, and farming systems that cannot be changed without their full and careful involvement. Participatory methods increase farmers' inputs in the decision-making process as well as in the dissemination of research products through their involvement in field trials, farmers' field days, surveys, and farmer-to-farmer diffusion of information. Obviously, this is not the only way that research results from the laboratory arrive at farmers' fields, but it illustrates the fact that applied biotech research can be targeted and tied to meet specific needs of rural farmers.

We live in a world that has become an increasingly interdependent "global village" due to advances in information and transportation technology. In this global village, millions have plenty of food to throw away, while millions of others die daily because they have nothing to eat. Although Africans are thankful for development and relief aid, they are uncomfortable about their condition of continuous dependence on handouts that come in many forms with no permanent solutions apparently in sight. Self-sufficiency

initiatives is one step in the right direction that deserves support from all those who want to help African scientists and farmers to feed their own people.

NO

Although hunger is sorely persistent throughout much of the developing world, Africa is the only region where it is actually getting worse. In Latin America and Asia, the past two decades have seen a modest decline in malnourishment among children. That helps explain why, sooner or later, almost any major agricultural development will have to justify itself in an African context.

A biotech fix would be costly for the farmer, would increase chemical use, would add no other benefits to the system, and in any case, does not yet even exist. On the other hand, fallow periods, when land is allowed to “go wild,” help maintain long-term productivity by reducing weed and pest infestations, and by allowing soil nutrient levels to recover. Improved fallowing is extremely low-cost and confers all the benefits mentioned above. It’s also readily accessible. In at least a rudimentary form, the technique is already being used by tens of thousands of farmers in eastern and southern Africa. It is projected that 50 million farmers will be using improved fallowing within the next five to ten years.

One of the most interesting features of the improved fallow system is that it allows for forms of research and development that farmers can do on their own. But if innovation is to contribute to the welfare of farming, it will have to extend beyond issues of yield. After all, many U.S. and European farmers have been teetering on the brink of economic extinction for years, and a substantial number have gone over it – even though they produce some of the highest yields in the world. In most developing countries, agriculture is still the predominant way of life, so the economic health of farming is a basic social issue. This is why the agricultural status quo is a dangerous absurdity. Corporations that sell farmers seed and pesticide are making tens of billions of dollars in sales each year, and those that distribute, process, and retail the harvests are making hundreds of billions. But farmers themselves are now members of the poorest, and ironically, the hungriest occupation on Earth.

Biotech farming can boost yield dramatically, but such improvements aren’t going to bring prosperity to farmers. Doubling and tripling yields doesn’t make much of a difference if you can’t get your product to market. One non-profit has expanded their agenda to include a kind of farmer empowerment. They now coordinate seven farm cooperatives so that local growers can capture the marketing and distribution advantages that come with scale. Instead of each farmer buying their own delivery truck and setting up their own office, the farm cooperative can pool its resources for a much larger delivery truck and office. Money can go directly into the farmer’s pocket – no middleman to pay, no bills for agrochemicals or expensive seeds. Foreigners don’t arrive with some technology with highly dubious potential. Instead, we have a local response to a local problem. And the response worked, because the produce was beautiful and the farmer got paid.

Does Welfare Do More Harm Than Good? (Finsterbusch & McKenna, 1984)

YES

New York is the most welfare-oriented community in the United States, and it is the most dramatic example of the results of trying to do good through government programs. Spending by the city government is larger relative to its population than in any other city in the U.S. But more money, more programs, and more taxes didn't work. They led to financial catastrophe without meeting the essential needs of the people. Let us take a closer look at a few other examples.

The major welfare-state program in the U.S. on the federal level is Social Security. On the one hand, it is a sacred cow that no politician can question. On the other hand, it is the target of complaints from all sides. Persons receiving payments complain that the sums are inadequate to maintain the standard of life they had been led to expect. Persons paying Social Security taxes complain they are a heavy burden. Taxpayers complain that the unfunded obligations of the Social Security system total many trillions of dollars, and that not even the present high taxes will keep it solvent for long.

Government programs to provide housing and medicine have also expanded rapidly. Housing programs started with government construction of housing units for low-income families. More recently, "rent supplements," or government subsidization of rents for privately owned housing units, have been added. In addition, the federal government has provided medical care for the military and veterans. After the introduction of Medicare and Medicaid, government spending on health mounted rapidly and the government's share of total expenditures on medical care has almost doubled. In terms of the initial objective, these programs have been a conspicuous failure. The public housing units have frequently become slums and hotbeds of crime. The inevitable result from the medical programs has been sharp increases in the price of medical care and in the incomes of physicians and others engaged in rendering medical services.

Why have all these programs been so disappointing? Their objectives were surely humanitarian and noble. Why have they not been achieved? As welfare programs expanded, the numbers changed. Legislators vote to spend someone else's money. The voters who elect the legislators are in one sense voting to spend their own money on themselves, but not in any direct sense of spending. The connection between the taxes any individual pays and the spending he votes for is exceedingly loose. In practice, voters, like legislators, are inclined to regard someone else as paying for the programs the legislator votes for. Bureaucrats who administer the programs are also spending someone else's money. Little wonder that the amount spent explodes.

Most of the present welfare programs should never have been enacted. If they had not been, many of the people now dependent on them would have become self-reliant individuals instead of wards of the state. In the short run, that might have appeared cruel for some, leaving them no option to low-paying, unattractive work. But in the long run, it would have been far more humane.

NO

The true social role of government is very wide and it penetrates into the remotest corners of our daily lives in ways that are so familiar to us we are scarcely conscious of them. In view of this, the currently popular call to “get government off our backs” seems rather ludicrous. Equally nonsensical is the assertion that the taxing power of the federal government should never be used to promote social change. However, the federal government is in the business of influencing social change every minute of every day. To eliminate its social role, its responsibility to promote constructive social change, would be to eliminate a vast part of its general role and would take us back to the earliest days of the Republic when we tried, unsuccessfully, to govern ourselves through a loose confederation of the states.

A sharp reduction of the social role of the federal government is not in the interests of the nation. Looking backward over the past few decades, we can see that it is myth, not fact, that federal social programs for the most part failed. On the contrary, social programs greatly reduced poverty, hunger, malnutrition, infectious disease, and infant mortality. They made health care much more widely available. They gave dignity and opportunity to many of our fellow citizens. In these and other ways, social programs accomplish a great deal. Why, we may ask, should we abandon a public policy approach that achieved so much?

If one believes that the development of people – all people, whatever their economic status, physical or mental characteristics, sex, or color – is our highest priority, because it is fundamental to economic growth and to national security, and if one believes that equity among individual Americans on a national basis is the cornerstone of a workable society, then one must favor strong participation by the federal government in meeting the nation’s social needs. If, on the other hand, one is not particularly concerned about the prospect of social unrest ahead, if one does not fear the consequences of reduced investment in people for economic growth and national security, if equity on a national basis is not high on the agenda, and if one believes that the workings of a free market economy can take care of most of the nation’s social ills, then there will be little desire to see the federal social role maintained.

Through a wise and skillful exercise of federal executive and legislative power, we have the ability to ensure that every American has a chance to reach his or her true potential; that discrimination against any person on account of race, sex, or cultural background is eradicated; that the hungry are fed and the handicapped cared for; that every family has a decent place to live; that minimum standards of health care are available to all; and that the elderly are protected. All of this we can do, and we can do it with the resources that will be available to the nation, without sacrificing either our security or economic growth.

Should Multiculturalism Permeate School Curriculum? (Noll, 2001)

YES

It is by now a truism that our country's public schools are undergoing a dramatic shift that reflects the growing diversity of our population. Yet many educators and the schools in which they work seem no better prepared for this change than they were a decade ago. Most educators nationwide are white, middle class, monolingual English-speaking women and men who have had little direct experience with cultural, ethnic, linguistic, or other kinds of diversity, but they are teaching students who are phenomenally diverse in every way.

Contrary to what the pundits who oppose multicultural education might say, multicultural education is not about political correctness, sensitivity training, or ethnic cheerleading. It is primarily about social justice. Given the vastly unequal educational outcomes among students of different backgrounds, equalizing conditions for student learning needs to be at the core of a concern for diversity. A concern for social justice means looking critically at why and how our schools are unjust for some students. It means that we need to analyze school policies and practices that devalue the identities of some students while overvaluing others.

Schools inevitably reflect society, and the evidence that our society is becoming more unequal is growing every day. Inequality is a fact of life, but many educators refuse to believe or accept it, and they persist in blaming children, their families, their cultural and linguistic backgrounds, or laziness as the culprits. Once educators accept the fact that inequality is alive and thriving in our schools, they can proceed to do something about it. Until they do, little will change.

We can no longer afford to behave as if diversity were a dirty word. Every day, more research underscores the positive influence that cultural and linguistic diversity has on student learning. Yet we insist on erasing cultural and linguistic differences as if they were a burden rather than an asset. To become effective teachers of all students, educators must undergo a profound shift in their beliefs, attitudes, and values about difference.

Anybody who has walked into a classroom knows that teaching and learning are above all about relationships, and these relationships can have a profound impact on students' futures. But significant relationships with students are difficult to develop when teachers have little understanding of the students' families and communities. The identities of non-mainstream students frequently are dismissed by schools and teachers as immaterial to academic achievement. It is only when educators and schools accept and respect who their students are and what they know that they can begin to build positive connections with them.

Because most educators in the United States have not had the benefit of firsthand experiences with diversity, it is a frightening concept for many of them. If we think of

teaching as a life-long journey of personal transformation, becoming a multicultural person is part of the journey. However we begin the journey, what we say about diversity is severely limited by our actions. Acknowledging and affirming diversity is to everyone's interest, including middle class white students. Given the tremendous diversity in our society, it makes eminent good sense to educate all our students to be comfortable with differences.

NO

What began during the early part of this century as a shift towards increased awareness of ethnic and minority contributions to American history has evolved into a pedagogy that makes diversity and difference the prime movers of the curriculum.

Although learning should be lifelong, schooling is a finite process. Inevitably, additions to the curriculum made in the name of diversity and inclusion render the necessity of displacement. A curriculum can contain just so much, and because education succeeds only when it includes prolonged and in-depth consideration of specific books, authors, ideas, and historical events, more in education often is less.

Multicultural education is undermined by two fatal flaws. The first is that the more the curriculum represents a multicultural test based upon "exposure to diversity," the more shallow and superficial learning becomes. By disavowing the difficult dilemma of choosing what comes out, multiculturalism ultimately reduces education to its shallowest possibilities – the mere glossing over of diverse subject matter – and renders the kind of understanding that comes from intensive, prolonged study of selected material impossible to attain.

Multiculturalism's second fatal flaw is that it necessarily precludes the single most important requirement for successful education: coherent means to a discernible end. By denying the existence of desirability of a distinctive American culture, thereby repudiating the need for public education to assist in the process of assimilation, multicultural education is both aimless and rudderless. Multicultural curricula meander to and fro, touching fleetingly upon cultural tidbits of theoretically limitless diverse groups.

Contrary to the assertions of proponents of multiculturalism that limitless pluralism enriches education, the de-emphasizing of specific core material and factual knowledge in high school resulted in what it inevitably must have: a plague of ignorance. Multiculturalism's subordination of facts and knowledge to critical thinking skills demonstrates its educational bankruptcy, for any critical opinion worthy of a passing grade must evolve out of knowledge and be grounded in objective facts.

As is inevitable with a multicultural curriculum, in order to make room for diverse additions, one must make equivalent subtractions. Omitted from one such multicultural curriculum were Robert E. Lee, Alexander Graham Bell, Thomas Edison, Albert Einstein, and the Wright brothers. Ultimately, students educated within the vague parameters of this multicultural curriculum will learn the hard truth: that any opinion

about the birth of our nation without the knowledge of the First Continental Congress or of the Civil War without considering Robert E. Lee is not based on sufficient factual knowledge and, therefore, has little or no value in the marketplace of ideas.

Emphasis on multicultural diversity within the curriculum is not America's only choice. Educators should continue to explore other possibilities such as more diversity of schools and less diversity within schools. It will not be until the educational bankruptcy of multiculturalism is exposed fully that the deconstruction of American public education will be halted successfully.

Did World War II Liberate American Women?
(Madaras & SoRelle, 1993, Vol. 2)

YES

Men suspected that women would be changed by their wartime work experience, and their reactions ranged from cautious welcomes to offensive attacks. Feminists of the period often exhorted women to change, warning that otherwise they would become subjugated like the women of Nazi Germany. Even a moderate and “feminine” magazine sounded trumpets for change.

One of the striking themes in oral histories is the desire of women to test themselves, stretch themselves, prove themselves. Many women proudly proclaimed how they had “held their own with men.” In retrospect, this is probably what laid the groundwork for the transformation of someone from a woman who was “just a mother” to a self-confident participant in the wider world.

For the first time, many of these former war workers spoke up and challenged the male prerogative to make the big decisions. The money they had earned and saved lent them moral authority, but it was the confidence they had developed that enabled them to exert that authority. Studies of changing power relationships in the family in the 1950s have suggested that working class wives who had worked in the past participated more in these kinds of decisions. The work process itself engendered feelings and attitudes in the women that had a lasting effect.

Of what broader significance, then, was the changed consciousness of women that resulted from their wartime experience? For one thing, it contributed to the tide of rising expectations of women. That tide, ultimately, led to the birth and growth of a social movement for women in the 1960s, just as the rising tide of expectations among blacks fueled the civil rights movement. Furthermore, we must remember that the generation of older, married women who were so deeply affected was that of the mothers of those who built the current women’s movement. Even if the mothers’ experience had little direct effect on their own daughters, it may have helped foster the development of a working class feminist consciousness among young women.

Oral histories have revealed the often private and subtle ways in which individual women were changed by their wartime experience. These individual changes were not merely fleeting. For it is the changes that individuals experience that both push for and support social transformation. The connection is not always immediate or clear. There is usually a lag, with ideas preceding practice. For example, despite a growing belief in egalitarian marriage over the past forty years, household responsibilities only now are beginning to be equalized.

The potential for social transformation was created by the wartime need for women workers. For a brief period, images of women were revised, employment opportunities were expanded, and public policy was enacted that created new services for women.

These were necessary, but not sufficient conditions. Social values also had to change, including women's definitions of themselves. Women's wartime experience played a vital role in that process of redefinition – the reverberations of which are still being felt today.

NO

Like the depression, World War II brought new challenges and new disruptions to families. For many who looked forward to building stable and secure homes after the depression, the war put their hopes on hold. When thousands of men were called to war, their unquestionably manly responsibilities as soldiers took precedence over their roles as breadwinners. While the men vanished to foreign shores to fend off the enemy, the women were left to fend for themselves.

The war emergency required society to restructure itself and it opened the way for the emancipation of women on an unprecedented scale. The potential for gender equality now had a chance to reach fruition. In response to the needs of an expanding wartime economy, public policy shifted dramatically from barring women from jobs to recruiting them. Married women were not only tolerated in the paid labor force, they were actively encouraged to take "men's jobs" as a patriotic duty to keep the war economy booming while the men went off to fight.

However, nearly all the "men's jobs" filled by women went back to men when the war ended. Even during the war, both the popular literature and the politicians urged married women to return to their domestic duties and single women to relinquish their jobs and find husbands when the hostilities ceased. This advice reflected not only the affirmation of home and family, but the prevailing suspicion of women – especially unmarried women – who entered the world of men.

The employment of women during the war, then, created a deal of ambivalence. While encouraged to enter the paid labor force, women's public presence gave rise to concerns about the long-term effects of the changes that were taking place while the men were overseas. These concerns were eased by viewing women's jobs as temporary extensions of patriotism and domestic responsibilities that resulted from the emergency situation.

The vast changes in gender arrangements that some feared and others hoped for never fully materialized. Actually, the war underscored women's tasks as homemakers, consumers, and mothers just as powerfully as it expanded their paid jobs. Few women took jobs that were previously held exclusively by men, and those who did earned less than men. Although women demonstrated their eagerness for nontraditional work and proved themselves competent, few were able to retain those jobs after the war. As a result, wartime ultimately reinforced the sex-segregation of the labor force.

And so the potential for a new model family, with two equal partners who shared breadwinning and homemaking tasks, never gained widespread support. In the long

run, neither policymakers nor the creators of the popular culture encouraged that potential. Instead, they pointed to traditional gender roles as the best means for Americans to achieve the happiness and security they desired. Public policies and economic realities during the depression and the war limited the options of both women and men, and reinforced traditional arrangements in the home. Even during the war, Americans were heading homeward toward gender-specific domestic roles.

Should We Continue to Study Sex Differences? (Paul, 2002)

YES

The common description of empirical research as showing that sex-related differences are small, unusually unstable across studies, and inconsistent with gender stereotypes arose in part from a feminist commitment to gender similarity as a route to political equality. It also arose from piecemeal and inadequate interpretations of the relevant empirical research. These interpretations failed to place research on sex-related differences in the context of other psychological research and often implied that findings that were very ordinary (in terms of magnitude, consistency, etc.) were rather exceptional. Given the new understanding of empirical findings that is evolving, research psychologists should think more deeply about the purposes for which their research may be used. Is psychological research that compares the sexes beneficial or harmful? Does this research foster or hinder the social change that would increase gender equality?

The fear is often expressed in feminist writing that differences become deficiencies for women because women are an oppressed group. Anxiety about sex differences is especially strong to the extent that scientists favor biological explanations, because this approach might produce a portrayal of women as innately inferior to men. Yet, contemporary research that has systematically examined whether the traits and behaviors ascribed to women are regarded as inferior to those ascribed to men has not found evidence for this generalized unfavorable perception of women. This research has shown that the stereotype of women is more positive overall than the stereotype of men, at least in contemporary samples of U.S. and Canadian college students. The sex differences that scientists have documented do not tell a simple tale of female inferiority.

Social scientific knowledge of sex differences could enhance women's ability to understand the antecedents of inequality and to improve their status in society. Nonetheless, the aura of danger surrounds research on sex differences. Some critics urge psychologists to stop this dangerous work or at least censor it in various ways. Each researcher must, of course, weigh the potential costs and potential benefits. If enough research psychologists conclude that the costs outweigh the benefits, research comparing the sexes will recede once again because it is too politically relevant. However, the scientific work now possesses a momentum of its own, as more investigators become caught up in the sheer excitement of discovery and theory testing.

Contemporary psychology has produced a large amount of research revealing that behavior is sex differentiated to varying extents. The knowledge produced in this area of science can be beneficial both in helping women and men to understand their natures and their society, and in suggesting ways to enhance gender equality. Yet there surely are dangers that the new research will be used in far less beneficial ways by the forces of society. Therefore, the stresses between gender politics and the science of gender are not going to disappear. Never before in the history of psychology has such a formidable body of scientific information encountered such a powerful political agenda.

The results of this encounter should be instructive to all psychologists who believe that psychology should serve human welfare as it advances scientific understanding.

NO

The ideology of gender differences is ubiquitous in mainstream and minority United States cultures and has enormous significance for personal and social life. Our widely shared and strong beliefs about differences between women and men in interests, competencies, and roles are not benign or neutral, and their consequences are profound and continuous throughout the course of one's life. While the idea of difference is understood as a comparison of persons on some dimension, it also is embedded in a history in which one gender is valued over the other. Thus, the significance of gender difference ideology for social life results not only from the idea of difference, per se, but from the inextricable union of difference and inequality, in both the origin of a gender difference ideology, and in its operation in contemporary life.

"The study of gender differences in psychology has been nothing but a growth industry; it's here to stay." This assessment is chilling, since such study is intimately related to our culture's determined effort that gender differences be maintained. Cataloging gender differences serves a primarily political, not scientific, purpose as it rationalizes and perpetuates differences in power, and contributes to the continuation of separate spheres for women and men. A gender difference ideology, which has such destructive consequences, can be challenged through the painstaking work of social scientists who continue to present evidence of similarity between women and men with similar backgrounds, in similar positions and similar situations. Such data seriously challenge the easy and popular cliché that women are from Venus while men are from Mars.

An ideology of gender difference serves inequality and power differentials by limiting our vision and restricting our possibilities. In addition, a gender difference ideology is a source of personal confusion, stress, interpersonal difficulties, and social unease since our gender beliefs are often not reliable predictors of how individuals actually behave. Genders need not be understood through dichotomous opposition. Similarly, minority groups need not be understood in terms of how each differs from a majority norm but rather in terms of the historical, social, political, and economic forces that have influenced them.

It is because our construction of gender is inextricably tied to inequality that our study of gender must focus on the process and conditions that underlie this inequality. The typical focus, the ways in which women and men are "different," does not really help us celebrate diversity. An informed appreciation of gender-related diversity requires that we understand the continuing relationships between inequality and gender categories, that we always examine gender in its cultural context, and that we recognize the full range of gender diversity.

We must insist that diversity, a term not much in vogue, refers to an appreciation of human possibilities, and not to a parade of socially constructed differences. The ways

in which we vary needs to be understood as illustrating the potential of human organisms of both sexes for learning so that we can appreciate our commonalities as equal members of the human family.

Should Parents Be Allowed to Opt Out of Vaccinating Their Children? (Daniel, 2006)

YES

Parents do not want their children to be injured or die from a disease or a vaccination. As guardians of their children until those children are old enough to make life-and-death decisions for themselves, parents take very seriously the responsibility of making informed vaccination decisions for the children they love. That responsibility includes becoming educated about the relative risks of diseases when compared to the vaccines aimed at preventing them.

Like every encounter with a viral or bacterial infection, every vaccine containing lab-altered viruses or bacteria has an inherent ability to cause injury or even death. But because so little medical research has been conducted on vaccine side effects, no tests have been developed to identify and screen out vulnerable children. As a result, public health officials have taken a “one size fits all” approach and have aggressively implemented mandatory vaccination laws, while dismissing children who are injured or die after vaccination as unfortunate but necessary sacrifices “for the greater good.” This utilitarian rationale is of little comfort to the growing number of mothers and fathers who watch their once-healthy, bright children get vaccinated and then suddenly descend into epilepsy, learning and behavior disorders, autism, diabetes, arthritis, and asthma. Some adverse reactions are fatal.

The unanswered question is: To what extent has the administration of multiple doses of multiple vaccines in early childhood, when the body’s brain and immune system is developing at its most rapid rate, been a cofactor in epidemics of chronic disease? The assumption that mass vaccination policies have played no role is as unscientific and dangerous as the assumption that an individual child’s health problems following vaccination are only coincidentally related to the vaccine.

Questions about vaccination can only be answered by scientific research into the biological mechanism of vaccine injury and death, so that profiles can be developed to distinguish between vaccine-induced health problems and those that are not. Whether the gaps in scientific knowledge about vaccines will be filled in this decade or whether they will remain unanswered in the next decade depends upon the funding and research priorities set by Congress and the health industry.

All diseases and all vaccines are not the same, and neither are children. Parents understand the qualitative difference between options. They are calling for enlightened, humane implementation of state vaccination laws, including protections and exemptions for religious or conscientious beliefs. This is especially critical for parents with reason to believe that their child may be at high risk for dying or being injured by one or more vaccines but cannot find a doctor to write an exemption.

Parents, who know and love their children better than anyone else, have the right to make informed, voluntary vaccination decisions for their children without facing state-

sanctioned punishment. Whether a child is hurt by a vaccine or a disease, it is the mother and father – not the pediatrician, vaccine maker, or public health official – who will bear the lifelong grief and burden of what happens to that child.

NO

If the U.S. population or any population regards immunizing children as optional, we risk having large numbers of children becoming vulnerable to the most deadly diseases known to man. Without immunizations, there would be a significant possibility that children would contract some of the diseases that are now waiting to come back. These include whooping cough, polio, measles, mumps, meningitis, and diphtheria.

It is important to understand the concept of public immunity vs. individual risk. Individual risk is always a possibility with any procedure, medication, new activity, or vaccine. The key to any program or new intervention is to minimize the risk. There is no question that vaccines are the safest, most risk-free type of medication ever developed. Nevertheless, occasionally children have been known to experience a bad reaction to a vaccine. It is not, however, good public policy to give those few at-risk situations priority over the goal of protecting the population as a whole from disease. If the pool of unimmunized children becomes large enough, then the disease may reemerge, possibly in epidemic proportions.

For example, there is no scientifically proven link between the measles vaccine and autism. It is assumed that there has been an increase in the diagnosis of autism because the definition for who would fall under that category has changed. In addition, parents and medical professionals are more aware of this condition and are more likely to pursue its diagnosis. Though there may be an increase in the number of children who are diagnosed with autism, there have been many studies completed that show that the measles vaccine does not cause autism.

Should parents be able to choose not to vaccinate their child without being barred from enrolling that child in school? Immunizing children is a public health issue. Public health laws in all 50 states require immunization of children as a condition of school enrollment. This is as it should be, since public health must take precedence. Immunizations have a clear community benefit and, therefore, individual preferences should not be permitted to expose the public to the hazards of infectious diseases.

It is clear that the risk of exposing children to infectious disease should there be a decline in immunizations is a risk to which the population of the U.S. should not be exposed. It is always regrettable when an individual case of an adverse event occurs no matter what might have taken place. These adverse events clearly affect the child and obviously the family as well, and there indeed is always an outcry when this does occur. However, with all safe, proven interventions, an exception could always occur given a normal risk ratio.

It would be actual malpractice and poor public health philosophy to consider not immunizing our children against potentially deadly infectious diseases. We should be thankful to research scientists, epidemiologists, and the medical industry for the skill and care with which these important vaccines have been developed and monitored. There is no question that immunizations are one of the most important ways parents can protect their children against deadly disease.

Is the United States Justified in its Support of the Contras? (Rourke, 1987)

YES

For many years, Nicaragua was ruled by a series of right-wing dictators, but it was overthrown by a leftist guerrilla movement, the Sandinistas. At first, the U.S. government tried to have normal relations with the Sandinistas, but relations deteriorated rapidly. The U.S. accused the Sandinistas of suppressing promised democracy, of supporting leftist rebels in El Salvador, and of building a military force capable of threatening Nicaragua's neighbors. The U.S. began action against the Sandinistas that included supporting the "Contra" (against) rebels, who consisted of several loosely tied groups of rebels.

The Sandinistas have increasingly repressed freedoms in Nicaragua, and it is about time we ceased being fooled by Sandinista propaganda. It is about time we recognized that it is Nicaragua's aggression that is the source of the conflict in Central America. The principal target of Sandinista aggression has been El Salvador. Nicaragua has provided massive support to the Sandinistas seeking to overthrow El Salvador's government. That support has included training, command-and-control headquarters, and weapons, ammunition, and other vital supplies. Nicaragua has served as a sanctuary for the Sandinistas and headquarters for their political arm. Nicaragua has publicly identified itself with the goals and methods of the Salvadoran guerrillas. The evidence of this activity is real, varied, and massive. Sandinista commanders have, one after another, described in compelling detail the dependence of the Salvadoran guerrillas on Nicaraguan-supplied weapons and supplies, on safehaven in that country, on communications and command services from Nicaragua, and on training conducted in or facilitated by Nicaragua.

Also, there are the confessions of the Sandinistas themselves. They have, on several occasions, stated their capacity to halt the aid being provided to guerrillas in El Salvador. And yet, Nicaragua would have us, and the world, believe that none of this evidence exists. Nicaragua would like us, instead, to pitch all this evidence out the window and take its flat, unsupported word that "in truth, it is not engaged, and has not been engaged in, the provision of arms or other supplies" to the guerrillas in El Salvador. Nicaragua would have us disregard the tens of thousands of dead, the hundreds of millions of dollars in economic damage, the immense human misery it has imposed on El Salvador, and take its word that it has not attacked El Salvador.

I believe that continued U.S. support for the Contras is essential to induce the Sandinista regime to enter into meaningful negotiations. We have too often been faced with Sandinista promises that evaporate when the immediate tactical basis for their issuance has disappeared. The U.S. House of Representatives' approval of the request for further assistance for the Contras should give the Sandinistas good reason to negotiate seriously. Our support for the Contras is designed only to encourage the Sandinistas to participate seriously and in good faith. The question now is whether the Sandinistas truly want peace.

NO

In 1983, the U.S. House Intelligence Committee noted that assistance to the Contras was not working and would not work because the pressure represented by the Contras had the opposite effect than it was meant to create. It hardened rather than softened the resistance of the Sandinistas. It produced results exactly opposite to those aimed for by the United States. Negotiations failed. Still, the issue of providing more assistance to the Contras has been before the Congress ever since 1983. Today, the program of assistance for the Contras is just as unlikely to succeed as the program proposed in 1983. It differs only in its size, in the number of Contra fighters proposed to be armed, and the intensity of warfare that will likely result if it is approved.

The U.S. is still murky in its explanation of goals, yet it is understood that the Contra regime will not be sufficiently strong to overthrow the Sandinistas. The Contras will exert enough pressure only to force the Nicaraguan government to negotiate seriously with the Sandinistas. This approach ignores intelligence assessments that the Sandinistas are unlikely to agree to negotiations for the simple reason that they would threaten the very basic structure by which it controls Nicaragua. The result will not be a Sandinista willingness to change the undemocratic nature of the regime; the result will be further repression.

Furthermore, the improvements in the Nicaraguan military arsenal (helicopters, artillery, and mobility) make the prospects for future Contra successes dim. The Contras remain without a political infrastructure inside Nicaragua or a clear political message to give to the Nicaraguan people. The Contra regime is no more likely to defeat the Sandinista government than before. It is, in fact, less likely to do so. The U.S.'s policy of pressure has not worked and will not work in the future. It continues to be the assessment of the U.S. intelligence community that only U.S. forces could truly resolve the conflict in Nicaragua on a military basis.

I am deeply concerned that, as in the past, the Sandinista government is clearly moving down the path away from democracy and pluralism. I have no confidence that additional assistance to the Contras will produce the democracy the U.S. seeks to achieve in Nicaragua. Press censorship, repression of the church, and restriction on political activities will continue and perhaps increase. It is an unfortunate fact that continued and increased military pressure by the Contras will not cause the Sandinistas to change their policies. Even with increased military activity in Nicaragua, it is unlikely that the flow of assistance to the Contras will improve the situation. The House Intelligence Committee's review of the situation in 1983 and the record of the Contras since that time leads me to believe that the U.S. policy of additional assistance to the Contras will not work. It will, in fact, be counterproductive. I do not make this decision lightly, for the problem represented by Nicaragua is a serious one. But, it is a problem not likely to be solved by aiding the Contras.

Supplementary Material

Experiments 1 and 2: Session 1 Retrieval Practice Questions

Passages and test questions were developed from different books in the “Taking Sides” McGraw-Hill Contemporary Learning Series (www.mhcls.com).

SUPERFUND: Easton, T. A. (Ed.). (2006). *Taking sides: Clashing views on environmental issues* (11th ed.). Dubuque, IA: McGraw-Hill Companies, Inc.

WELFARE: Finsterbusch, K., & McKenna, G. (Eds.). (1984). *Taking sides: Clashing views on controversial social issues* (3rd ed.). Guilford, CT: Dushkin Publishing Group.

BIOTECH: Moseley, W. G. (Ed.). (2007). *Taking sides: Clashing views on African issues* (2nd ed.). Dubuque, IA: McGraw-Hill Companies, Inc.

LINCOLN: Madaras, L., & SoRelle, J. M. (Eds.). (1993). *Taking sides: Clashing views on controversial issues in American history* (5th ed., Volume 1). Guilford, CT: Dushkin Publishing Group.

WOMEN LIBERATION: Madaras, L., & SoRelle, J. M. (Eds.). (1993). *Taking sides: Clashing views on controversial issues in American history* (5th ed., Volume 2). Guilford, CT: Dushkin Publishing Group.

MULTICULTURALISM: Noll, J. W. (Ed.). (2001). *Taking sides: Clashing views on controversial educational issues* (11th ed.). Guilford, CT: Dushkin/McGraw-Hill.

SEX DIFFERENCES: Paul, E. L. (Ed.). (2002). *Taking sides: Clashing views on controversial issues in sex and gender* (2nd ed.). Guilford, CT: McGraw-Hill/Dushkin.

VACCINATION: Daniel, E. L. (Ed.). (2006). *Taking sides: Clashing views in health and society* (7th ed.). Dubuque, IA: McGraw-Hill Companies, Inc.

Note: Correct answers are underlined, and the type of higher order question (apply, analyze, evaluate, or create) is indicated below for illustrative purposes, but higher order type was not revealed to subjects during testing.

Does Welfare Do More Harm Than Good? (Finsterbusch & McKenna, 1984)

Session 1 Fact Questions

1) Which is one of the solutions the “yes” author proposes?

Eliminate Medicaid, but keep all veteran benefits

Keep all welfare programs, but reduce spending within each program

Eliminate some welfare programs and increase spending for remaining programs

Eliminate all welfare programs in the United States

2) According to the “yes” author, what is one reason welfare programs are so expensive?

A great deal of staff are needed to administer the programs

There is little connection between taxpayers and legislators

Recipients are dependent and require a lot of assistance

There are too many recipients and not enough taxpayers

3) According to the “yes” author, what is one downside of the Social Security program?

Taxes raised are not enough to help the federal government

Taxes should not be required from younger adults to pay for older adults

Taxes raised are not enough to keep the program sustainable

Taxes should not be required because older adults can take care of themselves

4) Which is the primary reason the “yes” author is against welfare programs?

Welfare programs don't benefit recipients or taxpayers

Welfare programs create dependence for recipients

Welfare programs are too expensive for taxpayers

Welfare programs are not the government's responsibility

5) What is one benefit of welfare programs that the “no” author supports?

They eradicate discrimination

They help support local communities

They are affordable and feasible

They help everyone, not just recipients

6) According to the “no” author, what is the purpose of taxation?

To provide citizens a way to support their government

To provide citizens with services they can't pay for on their own

To provide the government a way to act on citizens' behalf

To provide the government with means to improve society

7) Which is the primary reason the “no” author supports welfare programs?

They create independence, not dependence

They improve, not hinder, economic growth

They are the government's responsibility

They are a good investment of taxpayer money

8) According to the “no” author, a free market system
Can address problems of discrimination
Is insufficient to provide equality for citizens
Is the only alternative to welfare programs
Helps make welfare programs even stronger

Session 1 Higher Order Questions

9) APPLY: What type of society would the “yes” author expect if there were no welfare programs in the future?

A society in which all individuals are self-reliant and independent

A society in which there would be no role for the government

A society in which no one would be required to pay taxes

A society in which all individuals are treated equally

10) ANALYZE: Which author would agree with the following statement? “It is honorable for the government to help society.”

The “yes” author

The “no” author

Both authors

Neither author

11) EVALUATE: Which statement is an accurate evaluation or summary of the “yes” author’s views?

Welfare programs can never work, because they are always too expensive

Welfare programs are harmful, because they make bad situations even worse

Welfare programs waste taxpayer money on people who don’t really need help

Welfare programs could work, but they rarely meet the needs of the people

12) CREATE: How do you predict the “yes” author would react if he or she became unemployed and needed welfare assistance?

The author might accept government assistance, but would seek help from local organizations first

The author would not accept government assistance, but would try to find a new job

The author might accept government assistance, but would try to find a new job first

The author would not accept government assistance, but would seek help from local organizations

13) APPLY: What type of global government role would the “no” author support?

Governments around the world are obligated to help poor countries

Governments around the world are obligated to help when asked

Governments around the world are obligated to help all countries

Governments around the world are obligated to help countries that reciprocate

14) ANALYZE: Which author would agree with the following statement? “Investing in people is good for economic growth.”

The “yes” author

The “no” author

Both authors

Neither author

15) EVALUATE: Which statement is an accurate evaluation or summary of the “no” author’s views?

The government’s primary role is advancing equality

The government’s primary role is advancing morality

The government’s primary role is advancing security

The government’s primary role is advancing liberty

16) CREATE: Which tax and spending structure do you predict the “no” author would support?

Equal taxation of all Americans; equal spending on all Americans

Higher taxes for the rich, lower taxes for the poor; more spending on the rich, less spending on the poor

Equal taxation of all Americans; less spending on the rich, more spending on the poor

Higher taxes for the rich, lower taxes for the poor; less spending on the rich, more spending on the poor

Should Parents Be Allowed to Opt Out of Vaccinating Their Children? (Daniel, 2006)

Session 1 Fact Questions

17) According to the “yes” author, vaccination shouldn’t be mandatory because

- We can’t screen out vulnerable children
- Research has verified its ineffectiveness
- Vaccines do more harm than good
- Vaccines are prohibited by most religions

18) According to the “yes” author, parents have

- A responsibility to decide on behalf of their children
- The right to decide on behalf of their children
- An obligation to decide on behalf of their children
- The option to decide on behalf of their children

19) The “yes” author argues that we need more research in order to

- Determine the effectiveness of vaccines
- Determine the long-term effect of vaccines
- Determine the side effects from vaccines
- Determine the mechanism behind vaccines

20) Which is the primary reason the “yes” author believes that parents should be able to opt out of vaccination?

- Vaccination costs outweigh the benefits
- Vaccination practices lack solid research
- Vaccination for all children is too simplistic
- Vaccination has the potential to cause death

21) According to the “no” author, an increase in autism diagnoses is not a result of the measles vaccine, but a result of

- Poor childhood nutrition or immunity
- A lack of understanding of autism
- A change in the diagnostic definition
- Some being more at-risk than others

22) According to the “no” author, giving parents the option to opt out of vaccination

- Will only lead to more and more parents opting out
- Will increase, not decrease, danger to the population
- Is malpractice, and against state and federal law
- Is a decision for medical professionals, not politicians

23) The “no” author argues that vaccines may always carry some amount of risk, but that this risk

- Is a possibility with any medical procedure

Is too small to be of concern to the community
Should be of concern to scientists, not parents
Is less than the likelihood of a disease epidemic

24) Which is the primary reason the “no” author believes that all children should receive vaccinations?

Our obligation is to protect children, not parents
Our obligation is to prevent disease, not side effects
Our obligation is to eliminate disease whenever possible
Our obligation is to the population, not individuals

Session 1 Higher Order Questions

25) APPLY: Which of these situations is most consistent with the “yes” author’s beliefs about a parent’s right to vaccine exemptions?

A parent has the right to discipline their child as they see fit
A parent has the right to make all decisions for their child
A parent has the right to teach religion to their child as they see fit
A parent has the right to educate their child as they see fit

26) ANALYZE: Which author would agree with the following statement? “The ends justify the means.”

The “yes” author
The “no” author
Both authors
Neither author

27) EVALUATE: Which statement is an accurate evaluation or summary of the “yes” author’s views?

Parents are ultimately responsible for their child’s wellbeing
Parents always know what is best for their child’s wellbeing
The government has no right to interfere with a child’s wellbeing
The government has no right to override the wishes of a parent

28) CREATE: Which education system do you predict the “yes” author would support?

A system where the government decides which schools children attend based on ability
A system where the government decides which schools children attend based on proximity
A system where parents decide which schools children attend based on ability
A system where parents decide which schools children attend based on proximity

29) APPLY: Which of these situations is most consistent with the “no” author’s beliefs about a doctor’s obligation to protect his or her patients?

Doctors must do whatever it takes to save a patient’s life, even if treatment is illegal

Doctors must do whatever it takes to save a patient's life, even if treatment is unsafe
Doctors must do whatever it takes to save a patient's life, even if treatment is unethical

Doctors must do whatever it takes to save a patient's life, even if treatment is refused

30) ANALYZE: Which author would agree with the following statement? "Vaccine development should continue to be a priority of our federal government."

The "yes" author

The "no" author

Both authors

Neither author

31) EVALUATE: Which statement is an accurate evaluation or summary of the "no" author's views?

Mandatory vaccination protects the community with only negligible risk

Mandatory vaccination protects the community at the risk of children

Mandatory vaccination protects the community at the risk of parents

Mandatory vaccination protects the community and risk is unavoidable

32) CREATE: Which opinion regarding a public smoking ban do you predict the "no" author would most likely hold?

The ban would benefit smokers, non-smokers, employees, and potential tourists

The ban would increase tourism and revenue for restaurants, bars, and casinos

The ban would force smokers to stop smoking, thereby improving their health

The ban would give families the opportunity to enjoy a smoke-free environment

Should Multiculturalism Be Included In School Curriculum? (Noll, 2001)

Session 1 Fact Questions

33) According to the “yes” author, a multicultural education benefits

All students, white and minority

Teachers and students

Teachers, students, and society

Minority students

34) Which is one of the solutions the “yes” author proposes?

Identifying how society is biased toward some students

Identifying how teachers are biased toward some students

Identifying how standardized tests are biased toward some students

Identifying how schools are biased toward some students

35) According to the “yes” author, what is a responsibility of teachers?

To build relationships with students’ parents and siblings

To understand students’ cultural and linguistic diversity

To increase learning by encouraging participation from minority students

To treat all white and minority students equally and fairly

36) Which is the primary reason the “yes” author supports multicultural education?

To address the growing diversity of students in our society

To encourage teachers to become more sensitive about diversity

To develop stronger relationships between white and minority students

To overcome social inequalities, such as socioeconomic status

37) According to the “no” author, what is an outcome of multicultural education?

Deep learning about only a few topics

Shallow learning about a lot of topics

A lack of critical thinking skills

The learning of only facts and details

38) Which is the primary reason the “no” author is against multicultural education?

Multicultural education requires the removal of more important topics

Multicultural education is too sensitive and emotional for students

Multicultural education interferes with the teaching of social studies

Multicultural education is a fad that does not enhance student learning

39) According to the “no” author, why does multiculturalism represent “educational bankruptcy?”

It forces teachers to teach more history

It hampers standardized test scores

It lacks a clear goal or end result

It focuses on differences instead of similarities

40) The “no” author argues that a distinctive American culture is
Ubiquitous
Detrimental
Non-existent
Desirable

Session 1 Higher Order Questions

41) APPLY: Which of the following programs would the “yes” author most likely support?

A program that teaches women how to promote independence and autonomy

A program that teaches businesses how to promote community service

A program that teaches parents how to promote responsible spending habits

A program that teaches college students how to promote social justice

42) ANALYZE: Which author would agree with the following statement? “Building strong relationships between teachers and students is more important than what is taught.”

The “yes” author

The “no” author

Both authors

Neither author

43) EVALUATE: Which statement is an accurate evaluation or summary of the “yes” author’s views?

Multicultural education is the solution to America’s stagnant education system

Multicultural education should be required in every public school in the country

Multicultural education requires teachers to shift their beliefs and attitudes first

Multicultural education is necessary to be successful in today’s global economy

44) CREATE: How do you predict the “yes” author would react to an affirmative action policy at a local college?

The author would support affirmative action because it increases student diversity

The author would not support affirmative action because it promotes unequal treatment of students

The author would support affirmative action because it accounts for past inequalities

The author would not support affirmative action because it emphasizes race instead of academic achievement

45) APPLY: What type of educational curriculum would the “no” author most likely support?

A curriculum that emphasizes fact learning

A curriculum that emphasizes in-depth knowledge

A curriculum that emphasizes history and literature

A curriculum that emphasizes diverse subject matter

46) ANALYZE: Which author would agree with the following statement? “Education that teaches students knowledge, but not character, morality, and values, is incomplete.”

The “yes” author

The “no” author

Both authors

Neither author

47) EVALUATE: Which statement is an accurate evaluation or summary of the “no” author’s views?

Multicultural education should never be taught in public schools

Multicultural education is a waste of classroom time and resources

Multicultural education harms students over the long-term

Multicultural education is less effective than a traditional curriculum

48) CREATE: How do you predict the “no” author would react to a multicultural training program for employees at a local business?

The author would not support the program because multicultural training in the workplace is not valuable

The author would support the program because a multicultural workplace atmosphere would increase profits

The author would support the program because it is for adults, not students, so it wouldn’t negatively effect learning

The author would not support the program because it is not the employer’s responsibility to encourage multiculturalism

Is the Superfund Program Successfully Protecting the Environment from Hazardous Wastes? (Easton, 2006)

Session 1 Fact Questions

49) Before 1995, how did the Superfund program assess future health hazards?

- They assumed future residential use at the site
- They assumed future commercial use at the site
- They used projected exposure patterns
- They used a risk-based hierarchy system

50) What is an example of a remedy solution for a low-risk site?

- Removal of contaminated soil
- Incineration of waste and toxins
- Prohibition of drinking water wells
- Treatment of contaminated water

51) According to the “yes” author, what are two areas in which the EPA has made progress?

- Scientific research and treatment strategies
- Scientific research and cleanup effectiveness
- Risk assessments and cleanup effectiveness
- Risk assessments and treatment strategies

52) Early Superfund cleanup efforts were focused on which strategy?

- Source control treatment
- Excavation and disposal
- Soil vapor extraction
- Acid water containment

53) According to the “no” author, obstacles for the Superfund program include

- Political opposition to cleanup efforts
- Conflicts with other environmental agencies
- Resident opposition to cleanup efforts
- Lack of technology and research

54) Why is contamination at Tar Creek spreading?

- EPA failed to improve the air quality
- EPA failed to invest money in the cleanup effort
- EPA failed to contain gallons of acid water
- EPA failed to truck out toxic dirt

55) How did Tar Creek become contaminated?

- An abundance of toxic waste dumping
- An abundance of mine shaft drilling
- An abundance of noxious chemical use

An abundance of harmful radiation use

56) Consideration of implementation risks is important, because otherwise
Contamination will increase and spread
Cleanup will become impractical
Superfund sites will be ignored
Some techniques will be too costly

Session 1 Higher Order Questions

57) APPLY: According to the risk-based hierarchy system, for a cancer risk of 1 in 1,000,000 at a Superfund site, which remedy solution is most appropriate?
Removal of waste
Treatment of waste
Prohibiting land/water use
Restricting land/water use

58) ANALYZE: Which author would agree with the following statement? “An increase in federal funding for Superfund would be worthwhile, because cleanup of waste sites is crucial.”
The “yes” author
The “no” author
Both authors
Neither author

59) EVALUATE: Which statement is an accurate evaluation or summary of the “yes” author’s views?
The Superfund has made great progress recently
The Superfund program has always worked really well
The Superfund program needs a lot of improvement
The Superfund program is both effective and ineffective

60) CREATE: If the “yes” author had \$100 million to donate to the Superfund program, what do you predict he or she would encourage?
An increase in waste removal and disposal efforts
Greater development of flexible treatment options
Greater development of incineration techniques
An increase in research conducted at Superfund sites

61) APPLY: If the EPA trucked out the pollution from all of the homes and schools in Tar Creek, what would be the result?
The “no” author would be satisfied with the newly cleaned Tar Creek
The other waste problems in Tar Creek would be fixed
There would still be long-term health consequences from the waste
Tar Creek residents’ would no longer require kidney dialysis

62) ANALYZE: Which author would agree with the following statement: "EPA buyouts and settlements are not solutions, even if they increase the amount of money in the Superfund program."

The "yes" author

The "no" author

Both authors

Neither author

63) EVALUATE: Which statement is an accurate evaluation or summary of the "no" author's views?

The Superfund has made great progress recently

The Superfund program needs a lot of improvement

The Superfund program is both effective and ineffective

The Superfund program has always been ineffective

64) CREATE: If Superfund received an influx of funding, how do you predict the "no" author would react?

Good, but Superfund may still be ineffective because of partisan politics

Great, budget problems are the main reason for Superfund's ineffectiveness

Useless, money won't make Superfund more effective

Fine, but most of the money should go toward cleaning up Tar Creek

Was Abraham Lincoln America's Greatest President?
(Madaras & SoRelle, 1993, Vol. 1)

Session 1 Fact Questions

65) According to the "yes" author, why might Lincoln have been unfit to be President?

- He lacked administrative experience
- He was too arrogant and demanding
- He lacked experience as a war general
- He was too controversial and unpopular

66) How did Lincoln manage to pass the emancipation amendment?

- He insisted upon equal rights under the Declaration of Independence
- He included some restrictions on slaves, which benefited the North
- He promoted the amendment as the only way to end the Civil War
- He persisted until members of Congress agreed it was the right thing to do

67) According to the "yes" author, why did Lincoln support emancipation?

- He wanted to guarantee equal rights to all people
- He wanted to remain consistent with his moral convictions
- He wanted to guarantee the right of self-government
- He wanted to demonstrate the power of his influence

68) What was one negotiation that Lincoln approved?

- He agreed to support a bill he previously opposed
- He made exceptions for certain slave owners
- He provided jobs for relatives of congressmen
- He provided additional money to Republicans

69) Lincoln emancipated slaves,

- Although the situation required compromise
- And he was solely responsible for this outcome
- Which he always expected to accomplish
- With overwhelming support from Congress

70) According to the "no" author, why did Lincoln institute heavy taxes?

- To help the U.S. economy during wartime
- To provide subsidies for big corporations
- To pay for military resources and weapons
- To distribute income from the rich to the poor

71) Which is the primary reason the "yes" author supported Lincoln?

- Lincoln overcame adversity and depression
- Lincoln was an effective general and ended the war

Lincoln was a warrior for the American dream
Lincoln passed the emancipation amendment

72) Which is the primary reason the “no” author was against Lincoln?

Lincoln was dishonest and corrupt

Lincoln supported big corporations

Lincoln was a power hungry dictator

Lincoln touted his agenda as morally superior

Session 1 Higher Order Questions

73) APPLY: If Lincoln tried to pass a bill, but he did not receive enough votes in Congress, what would he mostly likely have done next?

He would have appealed directly to all voters

He would have appealed to members of Congress

He would have appealed to only those affected by the bill

He would have revised and resent the bill

74) ANALYZE: Which author would agree with the following statement? “Using one’s power of persuasion, even if you have to bend the rules, is sometimes necessary.”

The “yes” author

The “no” author

Both authors

Neither author

75) EVALUATE: Which statement is an accurate evaluation or summary of the “yes” author’s views?

Considering Lincoln’s depression, his accomplishments are impressive

Lincoln could persuade others, though he was unwilling to be persuaded

Lincoln often followed his convictions and he accomplished a great deal

Considering Lincoln’s beliefs about emancipation, he conquered an uphill battle

76) CREATE: Which of the following policy initiatives do you predict Lincoln would most likely encourage if he were alive today?

Bailouts for car companies and banks, because he supported corporations in the past

Equal rights for homosexuals, because he supported equal rights for slaves

An end to overseas wars, because he had an aversion to bloodshed and violence

Limitation of government mandates, because he supported the right to self-government

77) APPLY: Considering Lincoln’s preference regarding federal powers during the Civil War, Lincoln most likely would have:

Supported George W. Bush’s use of federal powers following September 11th, 2001

Disagreed with George W. Bush's use of federal powers following September 11th, 2001

Encouraged George W. Bush to seek Congressional approval for the use of federal powers following September 11th, 2001

Encouraged George W. Bush to negotiate with international leaders following September 11th, 2001

78) ANALYZE: Which author would agree with the following statement? "Lincoln's true beliefs were not always in accordance with the outcome of a situation."

The "yes" author

The "no" author

Both authors

Neither author

79) EVALUATE: Which statement is an accurate evaluation or summary of the "no" author's views?

Even though Lincoln did what was best only for the North, he still deserves praise for emancipating slaves

Lincoln was a cheating, greedy President, but he was responsible for some positive results

Lincoln was responsible for many poor decisions, and America was worse off because of Lincoln

Lincoln could not be trusted, as he deceived Americans in every situation and at every turn

80) CREATE: Which of the following governance strategies do you predict Lincoln would most likely support if he were alive today?

The obligation to always do what is morally right

The necessary use of compromise in politics

The responsibility to follow the Constitution literally

The commitment to protect the American people

Will Biotech Solve Africa's Food Problems? (Moseley, 2007)

Session 1 Fact Questions

81) Which is one of the solutions the "yes" author proposes?

Reallocate funds from anti-biotech activists toward more research

Drastically improve and increase the number of roads to food markets

Conduct more biotech research by diverse experts around the world

Increase the production of genetically modified crops and fertilizers

82) What type of farming method does the "yes" author support?

An academic model with researcher-to-farmer diffusion of information

A diversity model where farmers use biotech, pesticides, and fertilizers

A cooperative model composed of farmers, livestock owners, and researchers

A self-sufficient model where farmers conduct research and produce food

83) According to the "yes" author, what is one downside of foreign aid for African farmers?

Foreign aid is insufficient to adequately sustain African farmers

Foreign aid is expensive and cannot continue for much longer

African farmers would become dependent on foreign aid

Foreign aid offers short-term, but not permanent, solutions

84) Which is the primary reason the "yes" author supports biotech in Africa?

To increase food production more effectively using research

To increase food production in Africa, by Africans themselves

To increase food production and improve Africa's economy

To increase food production and reduce worldwide hunger

85) What is one benefit of the fallow period technique the "no" author supports?

It reduces pesticide use

It is cheap and accessible

It helps local economies

It is safer and healthier

86) According to the "no" author, how might an increase in food production worsen Africa's food problems?

It could increase profits for non-Africans only

It could increase the use of pesticides and other chemicals

It could increase supply without increasing demand

It could decrease the amount of land available for farming

87) Which is the primary reason the "no" author is against biotech in Africa?

Biotech benefits corporations, not farmers

Biotech has failed to work in the past

Biotech harms the environment

Biotech has failed to develop long-term solutions

88) According to the “no” author, why are Africa’s farmers the “hungriest occupation on Earth?”

Farmers are unable to produce enough food

Farmers have trouble selling the food they produce

Farmers fail to use technology correctly

Farmers don’t make enough profit when selling food

Session 1 Higher Order Questions

89) APPLY: What is a potential benefit of the farming method the “yes” author supports?

More biotech research could be conducted in a limited amount of time

Male and female farmers would have an equal role in food production

Farmers could decrease their use of pesticides and increase profits

Inclusion of different age groups may enhance the diffusion of knowledge

90) ANALYZE: Which author would agree with the following statement? “African farmers need to be able to produce food on their own, without foreign help.”

The “yes” author

The “no” author

Both authors

Neither author

91) EVALUATE: Which statement is an accurate evaluation or summary of the “yes” author’s views?

Funds spent on farming techniques other than biotech is a waste of money

Information sharing between farmers and researchers, and vice versa, is critical

Food production is vital, and we must do everything we can to increase yield

Farmers need to increase their profits, and using biotech research is the solution

92) CREATE: Which effort do you predict the “yes” author would support if there were a pest infestation in Africa?

A grant for research to be conducted by African farmers and scientists

A change in pesticide type, based on research from another country

A class for farmers to learn about pest control techniques from scientists

A supply of research-based fertilizer developed in another part of Africa

93) APPLY: What would happen if African farmers exported their food to other continents?

Farmers would be able to do this individually, save money, and make more profit

Farmers would still have the same issues of transportation, cost, and demand

Farmers could profit without having to use biotech to increase food production

Farmers would have a negative effect on the local African economy

94) ANALYZE: Which author would agree with the following statement? "Hunger is getting worse in Africa because of a lack of resources and money."

The "yes" author

The "no" author

Both authors

Neither author

95) EVALUATE: Which statement is an accurate evaluation or summary of the "no" author's views?

Selling directly to African consumers is the solution to Africa's food problems

Biotechnology is expensive, under developed, and bad for the environment

African farmers should never use chemicals, which only benefit corporations

Empowering farmers through the use of high-yield techniques is Africa's solution

96) CREATE: How do you predict the "no" author would react to the organic food movement?

Good, because organic food is easy to grow without using chemicals

Great, because organic food is natural and healthy

Just okay, because organic food is costly to both the consumer and farmer

Not good, because organic food is not always produced locally

Did World War II Liberate American Women?
(Madaras & SoRelle, 1993, Vol. 2)

Session 1 Fact Questions

97) According to the “yes” author, what laid the groundwork for the women’s liberation movement?

- New expectations from husbands and other men
- Insistence from feminists that women change
- Magazine articles promoting a transformation
- Desire of women to test and prove themselves

98) According to the “yes” author, how did earning money contribute to the women’s liberation movement?

- It gave women the means to make spending decisions
- It gave women the confidence to demand greater authority
- It gave women the independence to challenge their husbands
- It gave women the opportunity to leave the household

99) The “yes” author argues that the lag between evolving ideas regarding women and the actual practice of these ideas is

- Typical
- Unacceptable
- Unexpected
- Frustrating

100) Which is the primary reason the “yes” author believes that women’s wartime experience played a vital role in a liberation movement?

- Because of the wartime need for women to serve as heads of households
- Because of the wartime need for women to earn money for their family
- Because of the wartime need for women to undertake employment duties
- Because of the wartime need for women to fulfill both roles of mother and father

101) According to the “no” author, why were few women able to keep their jobs after the war?

- Women failed to keep up the same workplace efficiency as men were able to
- Women were encouraged to give their jobs back to men when they returned
- Women were asked to focus on their family, instead of work, when men returned
- Women failed to receive any encouragement from men to continue working

102) According to the “no” author, why were single women encouraged to find husbands after the war?

- Because society wanted to encourage a “baby boom”
- Because society sought to keep them out of the workforce
- Because society did not want them to enter the workforce
- Because society had doubts about single women’s motives

103) The “no” author argues that wartime primarily instilled
Ambivalence in women
Dependency in women
Patriotism in women
Responsibility in women

104) Which is the primary reason the “no” author disagrees that women’s wartime experience contributed to a liberation movement?
Popular culture encouraged women to retain their femininity
Popular culture recruited women into the labor force temporarily
Popular culture continued to reinforce traditional gender roles
Popular culture returned its focus to men when they came home

Session 1 Higher Order Questions

105) APPLY: How might the “yes” author react to women who choose to care for children full-time vs. women who choose to work full-time?

The “yes” author would support women who work full-time because they are financially independent

The “yes” author would support women who care for children full-time because raising a family is an important role

The “yes” author would support both types of women for asserting their preference and choosing their own lifestyle

The “yes” author would support women who split their time between the two and achieve a family-work balance

106) ANALYZE: Which author would agree with the following statement? “World War II restructured society and paved the way for transformation of traditional gender roles.”

The “yes” author

The “no” author

Both authors

Neither author

107) EVALUATE: Which statement is an accurate evaluation or summary of the “yes” author’s views?

Gender roles have changed because mothers have influenced their daughters

Gender roles have changed because individuals pushed for social transformation

Gender roles have changed because of an increasing societal value of equality

Gender roles have changed because of an accumulation of similar experiences

108) CREATE: Currently, 53% of the workforce is male, and 47% of the workforce is female. How do you predict the “yes” author would respond to this current inequality?

Progress is too slow, hiring practices and incentives for women must improve

Progress takes time, but at least the situation is better than it was after WWII
Progress is better than expected, demonstrating the large influence of WWI
Progress has reached its peak, the current situation is as good as possible

109) APPLY: How might the “no” author describe the social climate for men when they returned from the war?

Men returned to the same social climate at home, but not at work

Men returned to the same social climate at both home and work

Men returned to different social climates at both home and work

Men returned to a different social climate at home, but not at work

110) ANALYZE: Which author would agree with the following statement? “Women’s wartime experience had a large influence on their children.”

The “yes” author

The “no” author

Both authors

Neither author

111) EVALUATE: Which statement is an accurate evaluation or summary of the “no” author’s views?

Although women were eager to undertake new roles, society was not prepared to allow women to do so, at least not permanently

Although women helped maintain the wartime economy by working, women appropriately returned to their household duties

Although women were recruited to join the workforce, politicians urged them to maintain their household duties simultaneously

Although women had the opportunity to break out of traditional gender roles, they failed to take advantage of the situation

112) CREATE: How do you predict the “no” author would react to a present-day military draft of men?

Women’s wartime roles would still be viewed as gender-specific because society today is the same as it was in the past

Women’s wartime roles would still be viewed as gender-specific because wartime always limits the options of women

Women’s wartime roles would be viewed as gender-neutral because society is more gender-neutral today than in the past

Women’s wartime roles would be viewed as gender-neutral because wartime does not present the same economic difficulties

Should We Continue to Study Sex Differences? (Paul, 2002)

Session 1 Fact Questions

113) According to the “yes” author, why might some people be anxious about sex differences between men and women?

Because they imply that women should be treated different from men

Because they imply that women have always been treated unequally

Because they imply that women will always be different from men

Because they imply that women have always been inferior to men

114) According to the “yes” author, feminists are against sex difference research because

Feminists strive to highlight gender similarities instead of gender differences

Feminists are fundamentally against the practice of comparing men to women

Feminists only support research that shows that women are better than men

Feminists argue that sex difference research oppresses and offends women

115) The “yes” author argues that the current stereotype about women is

Less positive than the stereotype for men

Almost the same as the stereotype for men

More positive than the stereotype for men

More negative than the stereotype for men

116) Which is the primary reason the “yes” author believes that we should continue to study sex differences?

Because this area of research is ripe for exciting discoveries and theory testing

Because women can address inequalities and strive to achieve equal treatment

Because we haven’t conducted enough research yet to draw any conclusions

Because we will be better informed and can adjust our unequal political agenda

117) According to the “no” author, a gender difference ideology

Harms women and only benefits men

Causes an increase in gender differences

Values one gender over the other

Focuses on the conditions of inequality

118) According to the “no” author, what is one way to combat a gender difference ideology?

Eliminate funding for sex difference research altogether

Gather evidence of similarities between men and women

Celebrate the differences between men and women

Educate the public about minority genders and races

119) The “no” author argues that a gender difference ideology is a source of
Confusion and stress
Hatred and oppression
Political indifference
Inaccurate stereotypes

120) Which is the primary reason the “no” author believes that we should stop studying sex differences?

This research only serves a philosophical purpose

This research only serves a scientific purpose

This research only serves a cultural purpose

This research only serves a political purpose

Session 1 Higher Order Questions

121) APPLY: Which of these situations is most consistent with the “yes” author’s beliefs about the purpose of studying sex differences?

A study finds that men are better than women at math, so a professor gives women a few extra points on a math test

A study finds that men are better at engineering than women, so women majoring in engineering work harder

A study finds that women are better than men at management, so companies hire more women for leadership positions

A study finds that women are better than men at saving money, so the government gives tax incentives to men

122) ANALYZE: Which author would agree with the following statement? “Study of biological sex differences may portray women as inferior.”

The “yes” author

The “no” author

Both authors

Neither author

123) EVALUATE: Which statement is an accurate evaluation or summary of the “yes” author’s views?

Research on sex differences is a small, but growing, field of study

Research on sex differences yields no negative effects for women

Research on sex differences is too important and valuable to abandon

Research on sex differences has a unwarranted negative reputation

124) CREATE: How do you predict the “yes” author would react to a utopian society in which men and women were treated the same?

The “yes” author would be supportive, but would still encourage sex difference research

The “yes” author would be surprised, because men and women can’t be treated the same

The “yes” author would be disappointed, because sex difference research would be ignored

The “yes” author would be excited, and would no longer conduct sex difference research

125) APPLY: Which of these child-rearing techniques would the “no” author most likely support?

Treating boys and girls completely equal in every way possible

Fostering an understanding of both similarities and differences

Fostering an understanding of how boys and girls are different

Fostering an understanding of how boys and girls are similar

126) ANALYZE: Which author would agree with the following statement? “Sex differences are a result of nature or genes, not nurture or environment.”

The “yes” author

The “no” author

Both authors

Neither author

127) EVALUATE: Which statement is an accurate evaluation or summary of the “no” author’s views?

A gender difference ideology is destructive and must be eliminated from our society

A gender difference ideology only serves to improve the position of men, not women

A gender difference ideology ignores the influence of culture, context, and history on women

A gender difference ideology is a social construction, promoted by male scientists

128) CREATE: How do you predict the “no” author would respond if the U.S. government funded an increase in sex difference research?

The “no” author would argue that the government is providing a service to men

The “no” author would argue that the government is providing a disservice to society

The “no” author would argue that the government is providing a disservice to children

The “no” author would argue that the government is providing a service to politicians

Supplementary Material

Experiments 1 and 2: Session 2 Final Test Questions

Passages and test questions were developed from different books in the “Taking Sides” McGraw-Hill Contemporary Learning Series (www.mhcls.com).

SUPERFUND: Easton, T. A. (Ed.). (2006). *Taking sides: Clashing views on environmental issues* (11th ed.). Dubuque, IA: McGraw-Hill Companies, Inc.

WELFARE: Finsterbusch, K., & McKenna, G. (Eds.). (1984). *Taking sides: Clashing views on controversial social issues* (3rd ed.). Guilford, CT: Dushkin Publishing Group.

BIOTECH: Moseley, W. G. (Ed.). (2007). *Taking sides: Clashing views on African issues* (2nd ed.). Dubuque, IA: McGraw-Hill Companies, Inc.

LINCOLN: Madaras, L., & SoRelle, J. M. (Eds.). (1993). *Taking sides: Clashing views on controversial issues in American history* (5th ed., Volume 1). Guilford, CT: Dushkin Publishing Group.

WOMEN LIBERATION: Madaras, L., & SoRelle, J. M. (Eds.). (1993). *Taking sides: Clashing views on controversial issues in American history* (5th ed., Volume 2). Guilford, CT: Dushkin Publishing Group.

MULTICULTURALISM: Noll, J. W. (Ed.). (2001). *Taking sides: Clashing views on controversial educational issues* (11th ed.). Guilford, CT: Dushkin/McGraw-Hill.

SEX DIFFERENCES: Paul, E. L. (Ed.). (2002). *Taking sides: Clashing views on controversial issues in sex and gender* (2nd ed.). Guilford, CT: McGraw-Hill/Dushkin.

VACCINATION: Daniel, E. L. (Ed.). (2006). *Taking sides: Clashing views in health and society* (7th ed.). Dubuque, IA: McGraw-Hill Companies, Inc.

Note: Correct answers are underlined, and the type of higher order question (apply, analyze, evaluate, or create) is indicated below for illustrative purposes, but higher order type was not revealed to subjects during testing.

Is the Superfund Program Successfully Protecting the Environment from Hazardous Wastes? (Easton, 2006)

Session 2 Rephrased Fact Questions

When the Superfund program first started, how did the EPA assess future health hazards?

- They used a risk-based hierarchy system
- They used projected exposure patterns
- They assumed future commercial use at the site
- They assumed future residential use at the site

When EPA inspectors identify a low-risk site, what type of remedy solution might they use?

- Incineration of waste and toxins
- Prohibition of drinking water wells
- Soil vapor extraction
- Removal of contaminated soil

According to the “yes” author, the EPA has made recent progress in which two areas?

- Risk assessments and treatment strategies
- Scientific research and treatment strategies
- Risk assessments and cleanup effectiveness
- Scientific research and cleanup effectiveness

Which cleanup strategy was used at the beginning of the Superfund program?

- Acid water containment
- Source control treatment
- Excavation and disposal
- Soil vapor extraction

According to the “no” author, the Superfund program primarily has to deal with which of the following obstacles?

- Lack of technology and research
- Conflicts with other environmental agencies
- Political opposition to cleanup efforts
- Resident opposition to cleanup efforts

Tar Creek contamination is spreading because

- EPA failed to truck out toxic dirt
- EPA failed to invest money in the cleanup effort
- EPA failed to improve the air quality
- EPA failed to contain gallons of acid water

Contamination at Tar Creek was created by

An abundance of mine shaft drilling
An abundance of harmful radiation use
An abundance of toxic waste dumping
An abundance of noxious chemical use

If implementation risks are not considered, then
Cleanup will become impractical
Some techniques will be too costly
Superfund sites will be ignored
Contamination will increase and spread

Session 2 Rephrased Higher Order Questions

APPLY: Based on the Superfund risk-based hierarchy system, for a health risk of 5 in 10,000,000 at a cleanup site, which remedy solution should the EPA use?

Prohibiting land/water use
Removal of waste
Treatment of waste
Restricting land/water use

ANALYZE: Which author would agree with the following statement? "Waste site cleanup is imperative, therefore we should encourage Congress to increase federal funding."

Both authors
Neither author
The "no" author
The "yes" author

EVALUATE: The "yes" author would agree with which statement?

The Superfund program needs a lot of improvement
The Superfund has made great progress recently
The Superfund program has always worked really well
The Superfund program is both effective and ineffective

CREATE: Which effort do you predict the "yes" author would support, if there were a huge increase in funds for the Superfund program?

An increase in research conducted at sites
Greater development of incineration techniques
Greater development of flexible treatment options
An increase in waste removal programs

APPLY: What would happen if all the pollution were removed from the homes and schools in Tar Creek?

Tar Creek residents' would no longer require kidney dialysis
The other waste problems in Tar Creek would be fixed

The “no” author would be satisfied with the newly cleaned Tar Creek
There would still be long-term health consequences from the waste

ANALYZE: Which author would agree with the following statement? “EPA buyouts and settlements increase the amount of money in the Superfund program, but they don’t solve the problem.”

The “yes” author

Neither author

The “no” author

Both authors

EVALUATE: The “no” author would agree with which statement?

The Superfund program has always been ineffective

The Superfund program needs a lot of improvement

The Superfund program is both effective and ineffective

The Superfund has made great progress recently

CREATE: How do you predict the “no” author would react if the Superfund program received a substantial amount of increased funding?

Fine, but most of the money should go toward cleaning up Tar Creek

Good, but Superfund may still be ineffective because of partisan politics

Useless, money won’t make Superfund more effective

Great, budget problems are the main reason for Superfund’s ineffectiveness

Was Abraham Lincoln America's Greatest President?
(Madaras & SoRelle, 1993, Vol. 1)

Session 2 Rephrased Fact Questions

According to the "yes" author, which is one reason why Lincoln was unfit to be President?

- He was too controversial and unpopular
- He lacked experience as a war general
- He was too arrogant and demanding
- He lacked administrative experience

What did Lincoln do in order to pass the emancipation amendment?

- He included some restrictions on slaves, which benefited the North
- He persisted until members of Congress agreed it was the right thing to do
- He insisted upon equal rights under the Declaration of Independence
- He promoted the amendment as the only way to end the Civil War

According to the "yes" author, why was emancipation one of Lincoln's goals?

- He wanted to demonstrate the power of his influence
- He wanted to guarantee the right of self-government
- He wanted to remain consistent with his moral convictions
- He wanted to guarantee equal rights to all people

In order to pass the emancipation amendment, Lincoln

- Provided jobs for relatives of congressmen
- Agreed to support a bill he previously opposed
- Provided additional money to Republicans
- Made exceptions for certain slave owners

Ultimately slavery was outlawed,

- With overwhelming support from Congress
- And Lincoln was solely responsible for this outcome
- Although the situation required compromise
- Which Lincoln always expected to accomplish

According to the "no" author, Lincoln called for heavy taxes in order to

- Distribute income from the rich to the poor
- Help the U.S. economy during wartime
- Pay for military resources and weapons
- Provide subsidies for big corporations

The "yes" author supported Lincoln, largely because

- Lincoln was a warrior for the American dream
- Lincoln passed the emancipation amendment
- Lincoln was an effective general and ended the war

Lincoln overcame adversity and depression

The “no” author opposes Lincoln, largely because

Lincoln supported big corporations

Lincoln touted his agenda as morally superior

Lincoln was a power hungry dictator

Lincoln was dishonest and corrupt

Session 2 Rephrased Higher Order Questions

APPLY: Lincoln might have used which strategy to pass a bill after it was rejected from Congress?

He would have appealed to only those affected by the bill

He would have revised and resent the bill

He would have appealed directly to all voters

He would have appealed to members of Congress

ANALYZE: Which author would agree with the following statement? “Politics sometimes requires that we turn a blind eye.”

The “no” author

Both authors

The “yes” author

Neither author

EVALUATE: The “yes” author would agree with which statement?

Lincoln often followed his convictions and he accomplished a great deal

Considering Lincoln’s beliefs about emancipation, he conquered an uphill battle

Considering Lincoln’s depression, his accomplishments are impressive

Lincoln could persuade others, though he was unwilling to be persuaded

CREATE: Lincoln would most likely support which proposal if he were alive today?

An end to overseas wars, because he had an aversion to bloodshed and violence

Limitation of government mandates, because he supported the right to self-government

Equal rights for homosexuals, because he supported equal rights for slaves

Bailouts for car companies and banks, because he supported corporations in the past

APPLY: Based on Lincoln’s handling of the Civil War, he most likely would have

Encouraged George W. Bush to negotiate with international leaders following

September 11th, 2001

Encouraged George W. Bush to seek Congressional approval for the use of federal powers following September 11th, 2001

Supported George W. Bush’s use of federal powers following September 11th, 2001

Disagreed with George W. Bush’s use of federal powers following September 11th, 2001

ANALYZE: Which author would agree with the following statement? “The way a situation ended was not always the way Lincoln had wanted it to end.”

Both authors

Neither author

The “no” author

The “yes” author

EVALUATE: The “no” author would agree with which statement?

Lincoln was a cheating, greedy President, but he was responsible for some positive results

Lincoln could not be trusted, as he deceived Americans in every situation and at every turn

Even though Lincoln did what was best only for the North, he still deserves praise for emancipating slaves

Lincoln was responsible for many poor decisions, and America was worse off because of Lincoln

CREATE: Lincoln would most likely support which leadership position if he were alive today?

The obligation to always do what is morally right

The responsibility to follow the Constitution literally

The commitment to protect the American people

The necessary use of compromise in politics

Will Biotech Solve Africa's Food Problems? (Moseley, 2007)

Session 2 Rephrased Fact Questions

The "yes" author proposed which potential solution to Africa's food problems?

Conduct more biotech research by diverse experts around the world

Increase the production of genetically modified crops and fertilizers

Reallocate funds from anti-biotech activists toward more research

Drastically improve and increase the number of roads to food markets

The "yes" author supports which farming method?

A self-sufficient model where farmers conduct research and produce food

A diversity model where farmers use biotech, pesticides, and fertilizers

An academic model with researcher-to-farmer diffusion of information

A cooperative model composed of farmers, livestock owners, and researchers

According to the "yes" author, foreign aid for African farmers presents which potential obstacle?

African farmers would become dependent on foreign aid

Foreign aid offers short-term, but not permanent, solutions

Foreign aid is expensive and cannot continue for much longer

Foreign aid is insufficient to adequately sustain African farmers

The "yes" author supports biotech in Africa, largely because it may

Increase food production in Africa, by Africans themselves

Increase food production and reduce worldwide hunger

Increase food production more effectively using research

Increase food production and improve Africa's economy

The "no" author supports a fallow period technique, because

It is safer and healthier

It helps local economies

It reduces pesticide use

It is cheap and accessible

According to the "no" author, an increase in food production might hurt, not help, Africa's food problems because

It could increase supply without increasing demand

It could increase the use of pesticides and other chemicals

It could decrease the amount of land available for farming

It could increase profits for non-Africans only

The "no" author is against biotech in Africa, largely because

Biotech harms the environment

Biotech benefits corporations, not farmers

Biotech has failed to develop long-term solutions

Biotech has failed to work in the past

According to the “no” author, Africa’s farmers are the “hungriest occupation on Earth” because

Farmers have trouble selling the food they produce

Farmers fail to use technology correctly

Farmers don’t make enough profit when selling food

Farmers are unable to produce enough food

Session 2 Rephrased Higher Order Questions

APPLY: The farming method the “yes” author supports may be helpful because

Farmers could decrease their use of pesticides and increase profits

More biotech research could be conducted in a limited amount of time

Inclusion of different age groups may enhance the diffusion of knowledge

Male and female farmers would have an equal role in food production

ANALYZE: Which author would agree with the following statement? “Instead of relying on foreign help, African farmers must produce food independently.”

Neither author

Both authors

The “no” author

The “yes” author

EVALUATE: The “yes” author would agree with which statement?

Information sharing between farmers and researchers, and vice versa, is critical

Food production is vital, and we must do everything we can to increase yield

Farmers need to increase their profits, and using biotech research is the solution

Funds spent on farming techniques other than biotech is a waste of money

CREATE: If there were a pest infestation in Africa, the “yes” author would encourage

A supply of research-based fertilizer developed in another part of Africa

A class for farmers to learn about pest control techniques from scientists

A change in pesticide type, based on research from another country

A grant for research to be conducted by African farmers and scientists

APPLY: If African farmers exported their food to other continents,

Farmers would still have the same issues of transportation, cost, and demand

Farmers would have a negative effect on the local African economy

Farmers could profit without having to use biotech to increase food production

Farmers would be able to do this individually, save money, and make more profit

ANALYZE: Which author would agree with the following statement? “A lack of resources and money are making Africa’s food problems worse.”

The “no” author

The “yes” author

Neither author

Both authors

EVALUATE: The “no” author would agree with which statement?

Empowering farmers through the use of high-yield techniques is Africa’s solution

Biotechnology is expensive, under developed, and bad for the environment

African farmers should never use chemicals, which only benefit corporations

Selling directly to African consumers is the solution to Africa’s food problems

CREATE: How might the “no” author feel regarding the current organic food movement?

Great, because organic food is natural and healthy

Just okay, because organic food is costly to both the consumer and farmer

Not good, because organic food is not always produced locally

Good, because organic food is easy to grow without using chemicals

Does Welfare Do More Harm Than Good? (Finsterbusch & McKenna, 1984)

Session 2 Rephrased Fact Questions

The “yes” author proposes that the government
Keep all welfare programs, but reduce spending within each program
Eliminate some welfare programs and increase spending for remaining programs
Eliminate all welfare programs in the United States
Eliminate Medicaid, but keep all veteran benefits

According to the “yes” author, welfare programs are expensive because
There are too many recipients and not enough taxpayers
Recipients are dependent and require a lot of assistance
A great deal of staff are needed to administer the programs
There is little connection between taxpayers and legislators

According to the “yes” author, the Social Security program is problematic because
Taxes raised are not enough to keep the program sustainable
Taxes should not be required because older adults can take care of themselves
Taxes raised are not enough to help the federal government
Taxes should not be required from younger adults to pay for older adults

The “yes” author is against welfare programs, largely because
Welfare programs are too expensive for taxpayers
Welfare programs don't benefit recipients or taxpayers
Welfare programs are not the government's responsibility
Welfare programs create dependence for recipients

The “no” author supports welfare programs because
They are affordable and feasible
They help everyone, not just recipients
They eradicate discrimination
They help support local communities

According to the “no” author, taxation is required in order to
Provide citizens with services they can't pay for on their own
Provide the government with means to improve society
Provide the government a way to act on citizens' behalf
Provide citizens a way to support their government

The “no” author supports welfare programs, largely because
They improve, not hinder, economic growth
They are a good investment of taxpayer money
They create independence, not dependence
They are the government's responsibility

The “no” author believes that a free market system
Is insufficient to provide equality for citizens
Is the only alternative to welfare programs
Helps make welfare programs even stronger
Can address problems of discrimination

Session 2 Rephrased Higher Order Questions

APPLY: If there were no welfare programs in the future, the “yes” author would expect

A society in which no one would be required to pay taxes

A society in which all individuals are self-reliant and independent

A society in which all individuals are treated equally

A society in which there would be no role for the government

ANALYZE: Which author would agree with the following statement? “A government that helps society is admirable.”

The “no” author

Neither author

The “yes” author

Both authors

EVALUATE: The “yes” author would agree with which statement?

Welfare programs could work, but they rarely meet the needs of the people

Welfare programs waste taxpayer money on people who don’t really need help

Welfare programs can never work, because they are always too expensive

Welfare programs are harmful, because they make bad situations even worse

CREATE: If the “yes” author became unemployed and needed welfare assistance,

The author might accept government assistance, but would try to find a new job first

The author would not accept government assistance, but would seek help from local organizations

The author would not accept government assistance, but would try to find a new job

The author might accept government assistance, but would seek help from local organizations first

APPLY: The “no” author would support which of the following governance strategies?

Governments around the world are obligated to help poor countries

Governments around the world are obligated to help countries that reciprocate

Governments around the world are obligated to help when asked

Governments around the world are obligated to help all countries

ANALYZE: Which author would agree with the following statement? “To spur economic growth, governments should invest in people.”

Both authors

Neither author
The “no” author
The “yes” author

EVALUATE: The “no” author would agree with which statement?

The government’s primary role is advancing liberty

The government’s primary role is advancing equality

The government’s primary role is advancing morality

The government’s primary role is advancing security

CREATE: The “no” author would support which tax and spending structure?

Higher taxes for the rich, lower taxes for the poor; less spending on the rich, more spending on the poor

Equal taxation of all Americans; less spending on the rich, more spending on the poor

Higher taxes for the rich, lower taxes for the poor; more spending on the rich, less spending on the poor

Equal taxation of all Americans; equal spending on all Americans

Should Multiculturalism Be Included In School Curriculum? (Noll, 2001)

Session 2 Rephrased Fact Questions

According to the “yes” author, a multicultural education helps which group of people?

Minority students

Teachers, students, and society

Teachers and students

All students, white and minority

The “yes” author argues that a multicultural education should include

Identifying how schools are biased toward some students

Identifying how society is biased toward some students

Identifying how standardized tests are biased toward some students

Identifying how teachers are biased toward some students

According to the “yes” author, teachers are responsible for

Treating all white and minority students equally and fairly

Increasing learning by encouraging participation from minority students

Building relationships with students’ parents and siblings

Understanding students’ cultural and linguistic diversity

The “yes” author supports multicultural education, largely because it

Develops stronger relationships between white and minority students

Overcomes social inequalities, such as socioeconomic status

Addresses the growing diversity of students in our society

Encourages teachers to become more sensitive about diversity

According to the “no” author, a multicultural education typically results in

A lack of critical thinking skills

Deep learning about only a few topics

Shallow learning about a lot of topics

The learning of only facts and details

The “no” author is against multicultural education, largely because

Multicultural education is a fad that does not enhance student learning

Multicultural education is too sensitive and emotional for students

Multicultural education interferes with the teaching of social studies

Multicultural education requires the removal of more important topics

According to the “no” author, multiculturalism represents an “educational bankruptcy” because

It lacks a clear goal or end result

It hampers standardized test scores

It forces teachers to teach more history

It focuses on differences instead of similarities

The “no” author argues that promotion of a unique American culture is
Detrimental
Desirable
Non-existent
Ubiquitous

Session 2 Rephrased Higher Order Questions

APPLY: The “yes” author would most likely support which of the following programs?
A program that teaches parents how to promote responsible spending habits
A program that teaches women how to promote independence and autonomy
A program that teaches college students how to promote social justice
A program that teaches businesses how to promote community service

ANALYZE: Which author would agree with the following statement? “Content taught in classrooms is less important than building strong relationships between teachers and students.”
Both authors
The “no” author
Neither author
The “yes” author

EVALUATE: The “yes” author would agree with which statement?
Multicultural education should be required in every public school in the country
Multicultural education requires teachers to shift their beliefs and attitudes first
Multicultural education is necessary to be successful in today’s global economy
Multicultural education is the solution to America’s stagnant education system

CREATE: If an affirmative action policy were implemented at a local college,
The “yes” author would not support affirmative action because it promotes unequal treatment of students
The “yes” author would support affirmative action because it accounts for past inequalities
The “yes” author would support affirmative action because it increases student diversity
The “yes” author would not support affirmative action because it emphasizes race instead of academic achievement

APPLY: The “no” author would most likely support which of these curricula?
A curriculum that emphasizes diverse subject matter
A curriculum that emphasizes fact learning
A curriculum that emphasizes history and literature
A curriculum that emphasizes in-depth knowledge

ANALYZE: Which author would agree with the following statement? "Education that teaches students content, but not disposition, ethics, and ideals, is incomplete."

Both authors

The "no" author

The "yes" author

Neither author

EVALUATE: The "no" author would agree with which statement?

Multicultural education is less effective than a traditional curriculum

Multicultural education should never be taught in public schools

Multicultural education harms students over the long-term

Multicultural education is a waste of classroom time and resources

CREATE: If a multicultural training program for employees were implemented at a local business,

The "no" author would support the program because a multicultural workplace atmosphere would increase profits

The "no" author would support the program because it is for adults, not students, so it wouldn't negatively effect learning

The "no" author would not support the program because it is not the employer's responsibility to encourage multiculturalism

The "no" author would not support the program because multicultural training in the workplace is not valuable

Did World War II Liberate American Women?
(Madaras & SoRelle, 1993, Vol. 2)

Session 2 Rephrased Fact Questions

According to the “yes” author, the women’s liberation movement began because of
Magazine articles promoting a transformation
New expectations from husbands and other men
The desire of women to test and prove themselves
Insistence from feminists that women change

According to the “yes” author, earning money had a large influence on the women’s liberation movement because
It gave women the confidence to demand greater authority
It gave women the independence to challenge their husbands
It gave women the opportunity to leave the household
It gave women the means to make spending decisions

The “yes” author argues that a delay between idea formation and idea implementation is
Frustrating
Typical
Unexpected
Unacceptable

The “yes” author believes that women’s wartime experience played a vital role in a liberation movement, largely because of
The wartime need for women to earn money for their family
The wartime need for women to fulfill both roles of mother and father
The wartime need for women to serve as heads of households
The wartime need for women to undertake employment duties

According to the “no” author, few women were able to keep their jobs after the war because
Women were encouraged to give their jobs back to men when they returned
Women were asked to focus on their family, instead of work, when men returned
Women failed to keep up the same workplace efficiency as men were able to
Women failed to receive any encouragement from men to continue working

According to the “no” author, single women were encouraged to find husbands after the war because
Society did not want them to enter the workforce
Society had doubts about single women’s motives
Society wanted to encourage a “baby boom”
Society sought to keep them out of the workforce

The “no” author argues that wartime experience was responsible for
Patriotism in women
Responsibility in women
Ambivalence in women
Dependency in women

The “no” author disagrees that women’s wartime experience contributed to a liberation movement, largely because
Popular culture recruited women into the labor force temporarily
Popular culture returned its focus to men when they came home
Popular culture encouraged women to retain their femininity
Popular culture continued to reinforce traditional gender roles

Session 2 Rephrased Higher Order Questions

APPLY: Regarding women who care for children full-time vs. women who work full-time,

The “yes” author would support both types of women for asserting their preference and choosing their own lifestyle

The “yes” author would support women who work full-time because they are financially independent

The “yes” author would support women who split their time between the two and achieve a family-work balance

The “yes” author would support women who care for children full-time because raising a family is an important role

ANALYZE: Which author would agree with the following statement? “World War II modernized society and initiated the revolution of traditional gender roles.”

Both authors

Neither author

The “yes” author

The “no” author

EVALUATE: The “yes” author would agree with which statement?

Gender roles have changed because of an increasing societal value of equality

Gender roles have changed because mothers have influenced their daughters

Gender roles have changed because of an accumulation of similar experiences

Gender roles have changed because individuals pushed for social transformation

CREATE: Currently, 53% of the workforce is male, and 47% of the workforce is female. The “yes” author would most likely feel that

Progress has reached its peak, the current situation is as good as possible

Progress is too slow, hiring practices and incentives for women must improve

Progress is better than expected, demonstrating the large influence of WWII

Progress takes time, but at least the situation is better than it was after WWII

APPLY: When men returned from the war, the “no” author would argue that
Men returned to the same social climate at both home and work
Men returned to a different social climate at home, but not at work
Men returned to the same social climate at home, but not at work
Men returned to different social climates at both home and work

ANALYZE: Which author would agree with the following statement? “Women’s wartime experience greatly affected their children.”

The “yes” author

Neither author

The “no” author

Both authors

EVALUATE: The “no” author would agree with which statement?

Although women were recruited to join the workforce, politicians urged them to maintain their household duties simultaneously

Although women had the opportunity to break out of traditional gender roles, they failed to take advantage of the situation

Although women were eager to undertake new roles, society was not prepared to allow women to do so, at least not permanently

Although women helped maintain the wartime economy by working, women appropriately returned to their household duties

CREATE: Regarding a present-day military draft of men, the “no” author would argue that

Women’s wartime roles would be viewed as gender-neutral because wartime does not present the same economic difficulties

Women’s wartime roles would still be viewed as gender-specific because society today is the same as it was in the past

Women’s wartime roles would still be viewed as gender-specific because wartime always limits the options of women

Women’s wartime roles would be viewed as gender-neutral because society is more gender-neutral today than in the past

Should We Continue to Study Sex Differences? (Paul, 2002)

Session 2 Rephrased Fact Questions

According to the “yes” author, some people may be anxious about sex differences between men and women because

They imply that women have always been treated unequally

They imply that women have always been inferior to men

They imply that women will always be different from men

They imply that women should be treated different from men

According to the “yes” author, feminists are opposed to sex difference research because

Feminists argue that sex difference research oppresses and offends women

Feminists are fundamentally against the practice of comparing men to women

Feminists only support research that shows that women are better than men

Feminists strive to highlight gender similarities instead of gender differences

The “yes” author argues that the current stereotype about men is

More negative than the stereotype for women

Almost the same as the stereotype for women

More positive than the stereotype for women

Less positive than the stereotype for women

The “yes” author believes that we should continue to study sex differences, largely because

We haven’t conducted enough research yet to draw any conclusions

We will be better informed and can adjust our unequal political agenda

Women can address inequalities and strive to achieve equal treatment

This area of research is ripe for exciting discoveries and theory testing

According to the “no” author, research on gender differences

Values one gender over the other

Focuses on the conditions of inequality

Causes an increase in gender differences

Harms women and only benefits men

According to the “no” author, gender difference research findings can be challenged by

Educating the public about minority genders and races

Eliminating funding for sex difference research altogether

Celebrating the differences between men and women

Gathering evidence of similarities between men and women

The “no” author argues that gender difference research is responsible for
Inaccurate stereotypes
Confusion and stress
Political indifference
Hatred and oppression

The “no” author believes that we should stop studying sex differences, largely because

This research only serves a scientific purpose
This research only serves a philosophical purpose
This research only serves a political purpose
This research only serves a cultural purpose

Session 2 Rephrased Higher Order Questions

APPLY: The “yes” author’s beliefs about the purpose of studying sex differences are most consistent with which of these situations?

A study finds that women are better than men at management, so companies hire more women for leadership positions

A study finds that women are better than men at saving money, so the government gives tax incentives to men

A study finds that men are better than women at math, so a professor gives women a few extra points on a math test

A study finds that men are better at engineering than women, so women majoring in engineering work harder

ANALYZE: Which author would agree with the following statement? “Women may be depicted as inferior when studying biological sex differences.”

Neither author

Both authors

The “no” author

The “yes” author

EVALUATE: The “yes” author would agree with which statement?

Research on sex differences has an unwarranted negative reputation

Research on sex differences is too important and valuable to abandon

Research on sex differences is a small, but growing, field of study

Research on sex differences yields no negative effects for women

CREATE: Regarding a utopian society in which men and women are treated the same,

The “yes” author would be excited, and would no longer conduct sex difference research

The “yes” author would be surprised, because men and women can’t be treated the same

The “yes” author would be supportive, but would still encourage sex difference research

The “yes” author would be disappointed, because sex difference research would be ignored

APPLY: The “no” author would most likely support which of these child-rearing techniques?

Fostering an understanding of how boys and girls are similar

Treating boys and girls completely equal in every way possible

Fostering an understanding of how boys and girls are different

Fostering an understanding of both similarities and differences

ANALYZE: Which author would agree with the following statement? “Sex differences are due to nature, not nurture.”

Neither author

The “no” author

The “yes” author

Both authors

EVALUATE: The “no” author would agree with which statement?

A gender difference ideology is a social construction, promoted by male scientists

A gender difference ideology ignores the influence of culture, context, and history on women

A gender difference ideology is destructive and must be eliminated from our society

A gender difference ideology only serves to improve the position of men, not women

CREATE: If the U.S. government funded an increase in sex difference research,

The “no” author would argue that the government is providing a service to men

The “no” author would argue that the government is providing a service to politicians

The “no” author would argue that the government is providing a disservice to society

The “no” author would argue that the government is providing a disservice to children

Should Parents Be Allowed to Opt Out of Vaccinating Their Children? (Daniel, 2006)

Session 2 Rephrased Fact Questions

According to the “yes” author, vaccination should be optional because
Vaccines do more harm than good
We can't screen out vulnerable children
Vaccines are prohibited by most religions
Research has verified its ineffectiveness

According to the “yes” author, all parents have
The right to decide on behalf of their children
An obligation to decide on behalf of their children
A responsibility to decide on behalf of their children
The option to decide on behalf of their children

The “yes” author argues that more vaccine research should be conducted because we need to
Determine the long-term effect of vaccines
Determine the effectiveness of vaccines
Determine the mechanism behind vaccines
Determine the side effects from vaccines

The “yes” author believes that parents should be able to opt out of vaccination, largely because
Vaccination practices lack solid research
Vaccination for all children is too simplistic
Vaccination has the potential to cause death
Vaccination costs outweigh the benefits

According to the “no” author, autism diagnoses have increased, not because of the measles vaccine, but because of
A lack of understanding of autism
Poor childhood nutrition or immunity
Some being more at-risk than others
A change in the diagnostic definition

According to the “no” author, if parents were allowed to opt out of vaccination,
This would be malpractice, and against state and federal law
This would be a decision for medical professionals, not politicians
This would increase, not decrease, danger to the population
This would only lead to more and more parents opting out

The “no” author argues that vaccine risk
Should be of concern to scientists, not parents

Is a possibility with any medical procedure
Is less than the likelihood of a disease epidemic
Is too small to be of concern to the community

The “no” author believes that all children should receive vaccinations, largely because

Our obligation is to the population, not individuals
Our obligation is to prevent disease, not side effects
Our obligation is to protect children, not parents
Our obligation is to eliminate disease whenever possible

Session 2 Rephrased Higher Order Questions

APPLY: The “yes” author’s beliefs about a parent’s right to vaccine exemptions are most consistent with which of these situations?

A parent has the right to teach religion to their child as they see fit
A parent has the right to educate their child as they see fit
A parent has the right to discipline their child as they see fit
A parent has the right to make all decisions for their child

ANALYZE: Which author would agree with the following statement? “The achieved outcome is more important than the process along the way.”

The “no” author
Neither author
Both authors
The “yes” author

EVALUATE: The “yes” author would agree with which statement?

Parents always know what is best for their child’s wellbeing
The government has no right to override the wishes of a parent
Parents are ultimately responsible for their child’s wellbeing
The government has no right to interfere with a child’s wellbeing

CREATE: The “yes” author would support which of these education systems?

A system where the government decides which schools children attend based on proximity
A system where parents decide which schools children attend based on proximity
A system where the government decides which schools children attend based on ability
A system where parents decide which schools children attend based on ability

APPLY: The “no” author’s beliefs about a doctor’s obligation to protect his or her patients are most consistent with which of these situations?

Doctors must do whatever it takes to save a patient’s life, even if treatment is unsafe
Doctors must do whatever it takes to save a patient’s life, even if treatment is refused

Doctors must do whatever it takes to save a patient's life, even if treatment is illegal
Doctors must do whatever it takes to save a patient's life, even if treatment is unethical

ANALYZE: Which author would agree with the following statement? "Our federal government should continue to prioritize vaccine development."

The "yes" author

Both authors

Neither author

The "no" author

EVALUATE: The "no" author would agree with which statement?

Mandatory vaccination protects the community at the risk of parents

Mandatory vaccination protects the community with only negligible risk

Mandatory vaccination protects the community and risk is unavoidable

Mandatory vaccination protects the community at the risk of children

CREATE: Regarding a public smoking ban, the "no" author would argue that

The ban would give families the opportunity to enjoy a smoke-free environment

The ban would force smokers to stop smoking, thereby improving their health

The ban would increase tourism and revenue for restaurants, bars, and casinos

The ban would benefit smokers, non-smokers, employees, and potential tourists

Supplementary Material

Experiment 3: Passages

Passages and test questions were developed from :

Banks, J. A., Beyer, B. K., Contreras, G., Craven, J., Ladson-Billings, G., McFarland, M. A., & Parker, W. C. (1997). *World: Adventures in time and place*. New York, NY: Macmillan/McGraw-Hill.

The Russian Revolution

Vocabulary

Russian Revolution

tsar

strike

communism

totalitarian

People

Alexander II

Nicholas II

Vladimir Ilyich Lenin

Josef Stalin

Places

Russia

St. Petersburg

Moscow

Soviet Union

Read Aloud

“Peace! Land! Bread!” This slogan summed up what ordinary Russians wanted most in the bloody, food-starved days of World War I. One group promised to give them all these things and more. Once in power, this group would transform Russia and affect the whole world.

The Big Picture

World War I was the peak of a long era of conflict and revolution. You have already read about political and industrial revolutions that rocked the world in the 1700s and 1800s. In the early 1900s, while the “Great War” still raged, yet another revolution broke out – in **Russia**. The **Russian Revolution** was an extremely important event in modern world history.

In 1900 the Russian empire stretched across parts of Europe and Asia. It included people of many different cultures. Most, though, lived in western Russia, where the land was better suited for the empire’s main activity – farming. Most Russians were Christians. Muslims also lived in the empire, however, as well as many Jews.

World leaders took notice when revolutionaries overthrew Russia’s leaders in 1917. Revolutionary leaders began to build a government around the ideas of Karl Marx, whom you read about in Chapter 17. The world watched and waited. What would happen in Russia? Would Russia continue to fight in World War I? How would the revolution affect other nations?

Russia Under the Tsars

In the middle 1800s Russia was far from being a world power. While industry changed many parts of Europe, most Russians lived much as they had during the Middle Ages.

At the top of Russia's social pyramid was the **tsar** (ZAR), or emperor. The tsar ruled with an iron hand. Anyone who displeased the tsar might be killed or sent to prison in Siberia. Find this frozen steppe region on the map.

Beneath the tsar were a handful of rich noble families. At the bottom of Russia's social pyramid were millions of poor farmers. Their crops fed the empire.

Russian Serfs

By the late 1700s France and other European countries no longer had serfs, or farmers, bound to the land. In the early 1800s, however, most Russians were still serfs. Russian law said serfs were the property of their owners, although serfs could not be sold.

By the middle 1800s serf revolts in Russia were increasing in number. Tsar **Alexander II** began to fear a revolution. He also wanted to shift Russia's work force away from farming and toward industry. Alexander decided to abolish serfdom in 1861. To abolish means to end a practice. The Tsar said: "It is better to abolish serfdom from above than to wait until the serfs begin to free themselves from below."

In exchange for freedom and small plots of land, the freed serfs had to pay heavy taxes. Paying the taxes was difficult, since many families were given small areas to farm.

Worlds in Conflict

By the late 1800s Russian cities were growing. Hard times in rural areas forced many former serfs to move to the cities in search of work. By the 1890s factories and mills of the Industrial Revolution were springing up in Russia's capital, **St. Petersburg**.

Two Sides of a City

To poor farmers St. Petersburg was a new world. They stared in wonder at the grand winter palace of Tsar **Nicolas II**, who began his rule in 1894. Dozens of mansions, churches, theaters, schools, and universities lined the streets of the city. More than one million people lived in St. Petersburg.

The city also had a less spectacular side. Away from the palace and other beautiful mansions, mills and factories clustered together. Smoke from their chimneys filled the air above the overcrowded apartment buildings where workers lived.

Workers Protest

Inside the factories and mills, conditions were often grim and workers were angry. A protest in 1897 won them a shortened work day – to 11.5 hours. Factory workers protested again in 1905, shutting down the city with their **strikes**. A strike is a refusal to work in protest of unfair treatment.

On Sunday, January 22, 1905, thousands of striking workers marched toward the Winter Palace to speak with the tsar himself. The tsar's soldiers responded by shooting

into the crowd. More than 100 people were killed. Many others were injured. The day became known as “Bloody Sunday.”

A storm of revolts and strikes swept through the country after “Bloody Sunday.” Tsar Nicholas II agreed to share some of his power with a new elected parliament, called the Duma. The Duma called for changes that would advance democracy and help the poor. The tsar refused. During the next nine years, Nicholas and the Duma were in constant conflict.

War and Hunger

In the years following “Bloody Sunday,” unrest deepened in Russia. Things became even worse during World War I. More than a million Russian troops died on the battlefield. Some never even had guns or bullets to protect themselves, since weapons were in short supply. Most of the nation’s railroads carried supplies to battle. Only a few trains were available to bring food and fuel to cities. As a result, factories and stores often closed. Many people were left without work. Goods that were already hard to get became even more scarce.

March of 1917 began as one of the coldest, snowiest months that many people in St. Petersburg could remember. The weather kept farmers and their food carts away from city markets. Within the city hungry workers lined up in the cold for hours. They hoped to spend what little money they had on small loaves of bread.

Revolution Begins

The skies cleared and the weather changed in time for a protest held by thousands of unhappy people. For four days, demonstrators jammed the streets of St. Petersburg. Shouts of “Down with the war!” and “Down with the government!” soon drowned out the simple cry for “Bread!”

The tsar’s police called for help from soldiers who were staying in the city. Most of the soldiers, however, joined in the protest and turned on the police. With the soldiers’ help the protest became a full-scale revolution against the government.

Tsar Nicholas, who was away meeting with his generals, had no idea of what was happening in his capital. By the time he set out to return home, the spirit of revolution had spread. Angry railroad workers forced his train to a standstill. On March 15, 1917, Nicholas II was forced to give up his role as tsar. Sixteen months later he, his wife Alexandra, and their children were executed. The rule of Russian tsars had come to an end. Who would rule the giant nation now?

A New Government

After the revolution in March, the Duma chose leaders to run the country. Russia’s many problems, however, continued. World War I was still underway and Russian military leaders demanded that their troops be withdrawn from the front. City workers went on striking in protest of even longer bread lines and lower wages. Many farmers, hungry and impatient for change, began seizing land for themselves.

Meanwhile a political group called the Bolsheviks was gaining strength. The Bolsheviks were led by a Russian lawyer named **Vladimir Ilyich Lenin** (VLAD uh meer IHL yitch LEN in). He believed that a different kind of revolution was necessary to change the government. The Bolsheviks planned a socialist revolution based on the

ideas of Karl Marx whom you read about in Chapter 17. They wanted workers to control the government and own all property. Lenin promised Russians “Peace, Land, and Bread.”

The Bolsheviks Take Control

With the support of the soldiers in St. Petersburg, Lenin and the Bolsheviks overthrew the Duma in November 1917. Soon after this second revolution they pulled Russian troops out of the Allied war effort. Russia began peace talks with Germany. The Bolsheviks allowed workers to control factories and farmers to use the farmland of wealthy nobles. The Bolsheviks also moved the capital of Russia south to the ancient city of **Moscow**.

The new Bolshevik government had many opponents. Landowners, factory owners, and nobles were losing their rights, as well as their wealth and power. Christians and different ethnic groups also opposed the government. These people led a civil war against Lenin and the Bolsheviks.

The Russian people were already battered from world war and revolution. Their suffering became even greater, however, during this new civil war. Between 1918 and 1920, millions died from disease and starvation, as well as in violent battles.

Communism

Lenin wanted to create **communism** in Russia. Communism is a political and economic system in which all land and all businesses are controlled by the government.

In the months before the outbreak of the civil war, Lenin wrote, the Bolsheviks had left “one foot in socialism.” In other words, they had been moving slowly toward a society controlled by workers. Now, though, Bolshevik leaders took harsh steps to achieve communism in Russia.

The Bolsheviks outlawed all private property, including farms. Farmers were forced to give all of their grain to the government. Lenin replaced factory workers’ committees with new managers who were controlled by the Communist Party. Citizens were called upon to serve in the military. To break people’s loyalty to religion, the Bolsheviks closed churches and arrested religious leaders. Lenin insisted that all loyalty be focused on the government.

Union of Soviet Socialist Republics

By 1920 the Bolsheviks had defeated their enemies. Two years later they renamed the old Russian empire. The new nation became known as the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, or the **Soviet Union**. The soviets were councils of workers and soldiers formed during the revolution.

In 1922 Lenin became ill. He struggled to return to work, but another leader in the Soviet government was growing more powerful. His name was **Josef Stalin**.

Stalin’s Rule of Terror

Lenin died in 1924. Soon after, Josef Stalin became the new leader of the Soviet Union. In 1928 Stalin began working to make the Soviet Union stronger. He drew all power into the government. Stalin also created huge collective farms. Collective farms were run by the government and worked by many families. People not needed on farms

were sent to work in mines and factories springing up across the nation. An economy completely controlled by government is called a command economy.

Within just 20 years the Soviet Union became one of the world's strongest industrial nations. Thousands of railroad lines crisscrossed the country, linking towns and cities that had never been connected before. Around 1900 many Russian farmers had never seen a tractor. By the 1940s Soviet factories were making more tractors than any other factories in the world.

Totalitarian Rule

People paid a huge price, however, for growth and change in the Soviet Union. Stalin used **totalitarian** (toh tal ih TAIR ee un) methods to rule the nation. In a totalitarian society, a dictator, often representing a single political party, controls all aspects of people's lives. Stalin and the Communist Party controlled the Soviet Union through fear and terror. For many, life was more difficult than it had been under the tsars. People were arrested for speaking their minds freely or for writing to friends in other countries. Many managers were killed because their factories or farms did not produce an expected amount. Stalin also ordered his secret police to arrest anyone who he thought challenged him in any way.

Many of those arrested were religious leaders. Their followers were forced to worship secretly or face arrest themselves. Stalin had more than 15 million people killed or sent to prison camps in Siberia. Almost half of them were Ukrainians. Many starved because the collective farms failed to produce enough food. Large numbers of people were sent to camps where religious leaders, teachers, workers, and others Stalin considered "enemies of the people" were imprisoned.

Oil, iron, timber – all the resources of the Soviet Union's new industry – were in great supply in Siberia. Since few people lived there, Stalin used political prisoners to help collect the resources.

One women's camp had the job of cutting down trees. One of the prisoners, a teacher, described the camp this way:

The cold and the hunger; the hunger and the cold. This must have been the blackest, the most [deadly], the most evil of all my winters in the camps.

Why It Matters

In the early 1900s life changed dramatically in Russia during a period of revolution. Many of the changes that took place became the foundation of a communist system of government. For this reason, the Russian Revolution is also known as a communist revolution. One of the revolution's many effects was the formation of the Soviet Union.

Revolutionary leaders had promised "peace, land, and bread." Under the communist government, however, most people in the Soviet Union had none of these things. Millions were killed and sent to prison camps in Siberia by Josef Stalin. Stalin used totalitarian methods to rule the nation.

For many, suffering worsened when the Soviet Union and many other countries became involved in another world conflict. To the west of the Soviet Union, a dictator in Germany was making plans that would lead to war.

Sum It Up

- Millions of serfs under Russia's tsars lived in poverty. The abolition of serfdom in 1861 gave farmers a limited amount of freedom.
- The Russian Revolution began in 1917 as a revolt against World War I, the tsar, and poor working and living conditions. Seven months later Lenin and the Bolsheviks seized control, bringing communism to the country they later renamed the Soviet Union.
- Under Stalin, the Communist Party controlled the Soviet Union using totalitarian methods.

Think About It

1. What were the policies of the Soviet Union regarding religious beliefs and practices?
2. Define the term *communism*.
3. FOCUS: How were the governments led by Tsar Nicholas II and Josef Stalin similar? How were they different?
4. THINKING SKILL: Describe Josef Stalin's *point of view* about the need to totally control the economy of the Soviet Union.
5. GEOGRAPHY: Why might Stalin have chosen Siberia as a site for prisons?

World War II

Vocabulary

fascism
inflation
depression
propaganda
World War II
Axis
Allies
concentration camp
Holocaust
People
Adolf Hitler
Winston Churchill
Franklin Roosevelt
Anne Frank

Places

Pearl Harbor
Normandy

Read Aloud

“I pray to the Almighty God that He shall spare the nations the terrible sufferings that have just been [forced] on my people... Are [you] going to set up the terrible precedent of bowing before force?”

In 1936 Ethiopian emperor Haile Selassie (HĪ lee suh LAS ee) appeared before the League of Nations to protest Italy’s invasion of his African country. The League, however, did not come to Selassie’s aid. Ethiopia would not regain its independence for nearly five years. During much of that time, the world was once again plunged into war.

The Big Picture

After the signing of the Treaty of Versailles, the countries that had fought in World War I turned to their own affairs. In the last lesson you read about the communist revolution in Russia. In 1922, the dictator Benito Mussolini and his Fascist (FASH ihst) party rose to power in Italy.

The Fascists believed in a powerful leader, totalitarian government, and an extreme form of nationalism. They supported a government whose goals they thought to be more important than those of individual people. This type of government came to be known as **fascism**. In some places fascism also came to mean hatred of certain ethnic groups.

After Italy took control of Ethiopia in 1936, Mussolini joined forces with another fascist dictator, **Adolf Hitler** of Germany. The people of nearby nations began to see that fascism was a serious threat to peace.

Germany After World War I

In 1919 Germany began to live by the conditions of the Treaty of Versailles. The treaty stripped Germany of land and forced it to pay huge fines.

To meet these expenses the German government began printing large amounts of paper money. Before long Germany had printed so much money that it began to lose its value. The result was a period of inflation, or rising prices. Huge amounts of money were needed even to buy necessities such as food. By 1923 inflation had made German money practically worthless, and people's savings were gone.

In that year a bitter ex-soldier named Adolf Hitler led an attack against the German government in the state of Bavaria. Although the attack failed and Hitler was jailed, many Germans supported his actions. His followers were known as the Nazi (NAHT see) party.

Fascism in Germany

By the early 1930s, Germany and much of the world suffered a **depression** (di PRESH un). During a depression, fewer goods are produced, prices drop, many people lose their jobs, and money is hard to get.

During these hard times Hitler used **propaganda** (prahp uh GAN duh) to convince Germans that their nation would once again become powerful. Propaganda is the spreading of certain ideas or attitudes that have been exaggerated or falsified to advance a particular cause.

Hitler's propaganda spread the false idea that the Germans were a "master race," meant to rule the world. The Nazis wrongfully blamed Germany's Jews, along with the Treaty of Versailles, for the depression that was devastating the country. Promising to raise Germany back to glory, Hitler once again tried to gain control in 1933. This time he succeeded.

Hitler ruled as a fascist dictator, forming an alliance with Mussolini in Italy. He and the Nazis stirred up hatred against Jews. In five years the Nazis' plans would lead to the largest war in history.

A Second World War

In 1938 Hitler ordered Nazi troops to occupy neighboring Austria. With this command, Hitler knowingly broke the rules of the Treaty of Versailles. Then, in March 1939, Hitler seized control of Czechoslovakia. After years of trying to avoid war with Germany, the leaders of Britain and France promised to defend Hitler's next target – Poland. Europe was on the brink of war once again.

The German Advance

World War II began in Europe on September 1, 1939. On that day German tanks began a *blitzkrieg* (BLIHTZ kreeg), or "lightning war," in Poland. Hitler and Josef Stalin, whom you read about in Lesson 2, had recently signed a friendship treaty. With the help of the Soviet Union, Germany defeated Poland within weeks. Britain and France declared war on Germany but had not been able to defend their ally, Poland.

Eight months later German forces turned west. Hitler's armies quickly overran Belgium. They went on to seize Paris by June 1940. Hitler's fighting method of blitzkrieg was proving very effective. Germany had beaten France – a major world power – in only

six weeks! With much of France under German control, Hitler made Britain the next Nazi target.

The Battle of Britain

The British people prepared for the worst. The country's leader, Prime Minister **Winston Churchill**, declared:

We shall fight on the seas and oceans, we shall fight with growing confidence and growing strength in the air, we shall defend our island, whatever the cost may be.... We shall never surrender.

Two months later, in August 1940, the Battle of Britain began. For almost a year German planes bombed the island nation every night. The British air force fought back. Although many sought safety in underground shelters, more than 12,000 British people were killed in the fighting. Despite the cost Britain did not surrender. The nation stood firm, as Churchill had predicted.

Weather Plays a Part

In June 1941 Hitler ended the bombing of Britain. Germany had lost more than 2,000 planes, along with their crews. Having failed in Britain, Hitler decided to break his treaty with Stalin. He ordered his armies to turn east and invade the Soviet Union. The Germans began what was to become a three-year struggle for control of major Soviet cities and supply centers. Millions of Soviet soldiers and civilians died during the struggle.

The Soviet Union now became an ally of Britain. In spite of their political differences, the British welcomed the Soviets in the fight against their common enemy, the Nazis. By November 1941 German troops were very close to one of their goals: the Soviet capital, Moscow. Soviet armies fought to defend their capital and their country. The German troops were finally stopped, however, by a deadly northern winter. On December 6, the near-frozen Germans began to retreat. It would not be the last time nature played a part in the outcome of the war.

An Attack on the United States

War had begun earlier in Asia than it had in Europe. Japan had hoped to create an empire with an endless supply of raw materials and labor for industry. By 1931 Japanese forces had invaded northern China. Later Japan conquered about one quarter of China and some islands off the coast of South Asia. Find the region of Japanese expansion on the map on pages 544-545.

In 1940 Japan formed an alliance with Germany. The conquests and the alliance created tension between Japan and the United States, which was against Japan's continuing expansionist policy. Japan was determined to stop the United States from involvement in its expansionist plans.

On December 7, 1941, Japan launched an attack without any warning or declaration of war. The target was the United States naval base at **Pear Harbor**, Hawaii. More than 2,000 people died in the attack. The United States was now involved in World War II.

President **Franklin Roosevelt** declared war on Japan on December 8, 1941. Three days later, on December 11, Germany and Italy declared war on the United

States. Japan, Germany, Italy, and their other allies were known as the **Axis**. The **Allies** included Britain, France, the Soviet Union, the United States, and China, among others. The United States had to fight Japan in Asia and Germany and Italy in Europe and Africa. As in World War I, United States forces would be very important to the Allied war effort.

“The Longest Day”

For three years the United States, Britain, and other Allies fought the Nazis in Europe and North Africa. In that time, the Soviet Union struggled to push back and destroy the German invaders on its soil. Finally, Allied leaders prepared to put a risky plan into action. On the night of June 5, 1944, the Allies would begin a surprise invasion of Axis-held France. If they succeeded, Germany would be surrounded on three sides – west, east, and south. The allies’ code name for this operation was D-Day.

Allied leaders prepared their forces to land on the beaches of **Normandy**, France, at dawn on June 6. They would reach shore while the tide was low so that German weapons on the beach would be open to attack. Months earlier, weather experts had concluded that the best conditions for an attack would exist between June 5 and 7. One June 4, though, a terrible storm raged across the English Channel. Would nature stop the biggest sea invasion in history?

The storm actually helped the Allies. German commander Erwin Rommel believed that the Allies would not invade during such weather. He traveled home to Germany for a few days, just when D-Day arrived. The Allies attacked. Over 11,000 Allied planes dropped bombs and over 2,700 ships unloaded almost 200,000 men onto the beaches of Normandy. Find Normandy on the map.

Afterwards, an Allied soldier said D-Day seemed like “the longest day” of his life. At the end of that day, allied forces held the beaches. The allies would now begin to push the Axis powers east across Europe and west from the Soviet Union.

The End of the War

Less than a year after D-Day, Allied forces closed in around Germany. With the Soviet army already in the German capital of Berlin, Adolf Hitler killed himself to avoid capture on April 30, 1945. One week later, on May 7, 1945, Germany surrendered. Japan’s leaders, however, refused to give up the struggle for power.

United States leaders considered using a newly developed bomb against the Japanese. Invading Japan could lead to many deaths on both sides. Could the tremendously powerful atomic bomb bring about Japan’s surrender? On August 6, 1945, the United States dropped the first atomic bomb ever used in warfare on the Japanese city of Hiroshima (hihr uh SHREE muh). Most of the city was destroyed in seconds, and at least 80,000 people died.

Japan did not surrender. Three days later the United States dropped another atomic bomb on the city of Nagasaki (nah guh SAH kee). Japan surrendered on August 14, 1945. The most terrible war in history was finally over.

The Terrible Effects of Fascism

In the days before their defeat, German and Japanese commanders rushed to hide evidence of their **concentration camps**. Concentration camps are places where people are imprisoned because of their heritage, religious beliefs, or political views. Prisoners in Japanese and Nazi concentration camps were tortured and often killed. Millions of others were murdered as well.

The Nazis murdered about 6 million Jews, or two-thirds of Europe's Jewish population, in concentration camps or by execution squads. These people including women, children, and elderly people, had committed no crime. They were not soldiers. They were killed for no other reason than that they were Jewish. This deliberate destruction of human life is called the **Holocaust** (HOL uh kawst). About another 6 million people, among them Gypsies, Poles, Russians, and Slavs were also murdered in Nazi concentration camps.

One of the millions of young Jews who died in the camps was 15-year-old **Anne Frank**. She and her family spent two years hiding in the Netherlands before Nazi soldiers captured them. What did Anne Frank believe about people and about the future? Do you find her point of view surprising?

Many Voices Primary Source

Excerpt from The Diary of Anne Frank, July 1944.

It's really a wonder that I haven't dropped all my ideals, because they seem so absurd and impossible to carry out. Yet I keep them, because in spite of everything I still believe that people are really good at heart. I simply can't build up my hopes on a foundation consisting of confusion, misery, and death. I see the world gradually being turned into a wilderness, I hear the ever approaching thunder, which will destroy us too, I can feel the sufferings of millions and yet, if I look up into the heavens, I think that it will all come [out] right, that this cruelty too will end, and that peace and tranquility will return again.

Why It Matters

World War II was the largest war in history. Unlike World War I, which had been fought mostly in Europe, World War II took place in Europe, Asia, Africa, and the islands of the Pacific. While many battles took place on land, there were sea battles on the world's oceans, as well. The war left as many as 50 million people dead. Many millions more would be affected by its horrors throughout their lives.

People once again began to adjust to peace after a world war. It was not always easy. Destroyed roads, bridges, homes, and cities around the world had to be rebuilt. There were other serious problems, too.

Leaders of the United States and Western Europe feared the communist government of the Soviet Union. Soon the two most powerful Allies, the United States and the Soviet Union, would become bitter enemies. You will read about their conflict later in the chapter.

Sum It Up

- In the 1930s Nazi leader Adolf Hitler used propaganda to convince many Germans that their nation could return to its former power.

- A world depression in the 1930s caused suffering in many nations and helped to bring about the rise of fascist dictators, such as Hitler.
- The Nazis murdered about 6 million Jews in concentration camps. This became known as the Holocaust. There were also some 6 million other victims of the Holocaust, including Gypsies, Poles, Russians, and Slavs.
- Japan attacked and conquered parts of Southeast Asia and the Pacific. After Japan attacked Pearl Harbor, the United States entered World War II. The war came to an end after the United States used two atomic bombs on Japanese cities.

Think About It

1. How did the United States help the Allied war effort?
2. Why was D-Day an important battle?
3. FOCUS: How did Hitler use the problems created by inflation, the depression, and unemployment to make himself dictator of Germany? How did he use this power to bring about World War II?
4. THINKING SKILL: List three facts and one opinion about fascism.
5. GEOGRAPHY: What role did the weather and time of attack play in the planning and outcome of D-Day?

Supplementary Material

Experiment 3: Retrieval Practice and Final Test Questions

Note. Correct answers are underlined, and the type of higher order question (apply, analyze, evaluate, or create) is indicated below for illustrative purposes, but correct answers and higher order types were not revealed to subjects during testing.

Russian Revolution

Fact Questions

Why did Alexander II abolish serfdom?

- A) To focus Russia's work force toward farming
- B) To prevent an uprising from farmers
- C) To take away land from farmers
- D) To reduce taxes paid by farmers

What happened once Alexander II abolished serfdom?

- A) Farmers increased food production
- B) Farmers made a lot more money
- C) Farmers moved closer to cities to find work
- D) Farmers moved to rural areas to find work

Under Alexander II, which area of Russia experienced the greatest growth?

- A) Cities
- B) Siberia
- C) Palaces
- D) Farms

What led to Nicholas II's agreement to share some power with the Duma?

- A) Communal farms
- B) Bloody Sunday
- C) Disease and starvation
- D) Resistance from nobles

Why were Nicholas II and the Duma in constant conflict?

- A) Because Nicholas II wanted to help the poor
- B) Because the Duma wanted to support communism
- C) Because the Duma wanted to help the poor

D) Because Nicholas II wanted control of all of Russia's power

Why was Nicholas II forced to give up his role as tsar?

- A) Because the Duma elected a new tsar
- B) Because Stalin took over the government
- C) Because his wife and children moved to Moscow
- D) Because of angry protestors, soldiers, and railroad workers

At first, who did Lenin believe should control the government?

- A) Tsars and nobles
- B) People and workers
- C) Farmers
- D) The Duma

After a few years under Lenin, what happened to Russia's farmers?

- A) Farmers had complete control over their farms
- B) Farmers had to give all of their grain to the government
- C) Farmers were forced to sell their farms
- D) Farmers were running out of farm land

Why did Lenin close churches and arrest religious leaders?

- A) To focus all loyalty on work and factories
- B) To focus all loyalty on farm and food production
- C) To focus all loyalty on families and communities
- D) To focus all loyalty on the government

Why did Stalin become the new leader of the Soviet Union?

- A) Because of civil war
- B) Because Alexander II took over
- C) Because Lenin died
- D) Because of a strike

How did Stalin try to make the Soviet Union stronger?

- A) He gave all power to the people
- B) He built a lot of railroads and tractors
- C) He allowed the Duma to make decisions
- D) He improved working conditions in factories

Under Stalin, how would you describe everyday life for the Russian people?

- A) People were free to do whatever they wanted
- B) Stalin controlled all aspects of people's lives
- C) Stalin forced all people to go to church
- D) People were allowed to choose their careers

Higher Order Questions

APPLY: Based on what you know about Alexander II, how would he react if his military was about to revolt?

- A) He would try to prevent the revolt before it happened
- B) He would wait until the revolt started before taking action
- C) He would leave Russia and avoid the revolt before it happened
- D) He would order his police to attack the military to stop the revolt

ANALYZE: Which person would agree with the following statement? "People must pay taxes in exchange for freedom."

- A) Nicholas II
- B) Alexander II
- C) Lenin
- D) Stalin

EVALUATE: Which statement is an accurate summary of Alexander II's views?

- A) Stop something bad before it happens
- B) The government shouldn't control anything
- C) The government should control all power
- D) Farming is the key to Russia's success

APPLY: Based on what you know about Nicholas II, how would he treat poor people?

- A) He would share some power with the poor
- B) He would help the poor
- C) He would take money away from the poor
- D) He would ignore the poor

ANALYZE: Which person would agree with the following statement? "Revolutions are hard to prevent."

- A) Alexander II
- B) Lenin
- C) Nicholas II
- D) Stalin

EVALUATE: Which statement is an accurate summary of Nicholas II's views?

- A) A tsar should never share power with anyone
- B) Advancing democracy is important
- C) Sharing power prevents strikes and revolts
- D) Sharing power is sometimes necessary

APPLY: Based on what you know about Lenin, what probably changed his beliefs from socialism to communism?

- A) The starvation
- B) The civil war
- C) World War I

D) The Duma

ANALYZE: Which person would agree with the following statement? "I tried to help the poor, but that upset all the landowners and nobles. You can't make everyone happy."

- A) Lenin
- B) Nicholas II
- C) Alexander II
- D) Stalin

EVALUATE: Which statement is an accurate summary of Lenin's views?

- A) Ultimately, control by the government was what was best for Russia
- B) Ultimately, control by the people was what was best for Russia
- C) Ultimately, control by the Duma was what was best for Russia
- D) Ultimately, control by the farmers was what was best for Russia

APPLY: Based on what you know about Stalin, how would he have reacted when Alexander II abolished serfdom?

- A) Stalin would have agreed, because farmers deserve to have some freedom from the government
- B) Stalin would have agreed, because farmers could still be controlled by paying heavy taxes
- C) Stalin would have agreed, because it was the right thing to do and it would help everyone
- D) Stalin would have agreed, because Russia's workforce should be focused on farming not industry

ANALYZE: Which person would agree with the following statement? "People are the most productive when they are told what to do by one person, instead of listening to many people or doing what they want."

- A) Nicholas II
- B) Lenin
- C) Stalin
- D) Alexander II

EVALUATE: Which statement is an accurate summary of Stalin's views?

- A) A country will be strongest with a few people in charge
- B) A country will be strongest with many people in charge
- C) A country will be strongest with all people in charge
- D) A country will be strongest with only one person in charge

World War II

Fact Questions

What happened to Britain during World War II, when Winston Churchill was Prime Minister?

- A) Britain stood firm against attacks by Germany
- B) Germany stood firm against attacks by Britain
- C) Germany surrendered to Britain
- D) Britain surrendered to Germany

What did Franklin Roosevelt do during World War II?

- A) He dropped an atomic bomb on Japan
- B) He joined the Axis war effort
- C) He killed Adolf Hitler
- D) He declared war on Japan

Why is Anne Frank inspirational?

- A) Because she fought against the Nazis
- B) Because she had a positive outlook on life
- C) Because she survived the concentration camps
- D) Because she helped other Jews

Who did Hitler join forces with?

- A) Selassie, the leader of Ethiopia
- B) Roosevelt, the leader of the U.S.
- C) Churchill, the leader of Britain
- D) Mussolini, the leader of Italy

Why were Hitler's armies effective at occupying Poland and France?

- A) Because of a large army
- B) Because of special weapons
- C) Because of a lightning war
- D) Because of fast surrenders

Why did Hitler stop attacking the Soviet Union?

- A) Because the Soviet Union was too strong to defeat
- B) Because the Soviet Union had a winter storm
- C) Because the Soviet Union teamed up with Italy
- D) Because the Soviet Union and Germany signed a treaty

Why did Hitler join forces with Japan?

- A) So they could both take over the United States
- B) So they could work together to expand their empires
- C) So Germany could build an army base in Japan
- D) So Japan wouldn't join the Allied Forces

Why did Germany surrender at the end of World War II?

- A) Because of Hitler's death after D-Day
- B) Because of the atomic bomb
- C) Because the U.S. attacked Germany
- D) Because Germany's army ran out of resources

How did Hitler gain more followers for his Nazi party?

- A) He promised to improve Germany's living conditions
- B) He promised to end Germany's economic depression
- C) He promised to expand Germany's industry jobs
- D) He promised to bring back Germany's glory and power

Under Hitler, which goals were the most important to achieve?

- A) The people's goals
- B) Japan's goals
- C) The government's goals
- D) The Allies's goals

Why did Hitler invade the Soviet Union?

- A) Because he failed during the Battle of Britain
- B) Because he wanted to break the Treaty of Versailles
- C) Because he wanted to steal Russia's military
- D) Because he failed during the Battle of Normandy

Under Hitler, what led to the largest number of human deaths?

- A) The attack on Britain
- B) The attack on Poland
- C) Concentration camps
- D) Atomic bombs in Japan

Higher Order Questions

APPLY: Based on what you know about Franklin Roosevelt, what would he do if Spain attacked the U.S.?

- A) He would surrender to Spain
- B) He would drop an atomic bomb on Spain
- C) He would attack Spain in return
- D) He would negotiate with Spain

ANALYZE: Which person would agree with the following statement? "Even if people do bad things, they are still good people."

- A) Franklin Roosevelt
- B) Winston Churchill
- C) Adolf Hitler

D) Anne Frank

EVALUATE: Which statement is an accurate summary of Winston Churchill's views?

- A) War is sometimes necessary, but not always
- B) A country should always protect its soldiers
- C) Don't give up, even when it's tough
- D) Help from other countries is the only way to win

APPLY: Based on what you know about Hitler, how might he have reacted if Japan didn't join forces with Germany?

- A) He would have ignored Japan
- B) He would have attacked Japan
- C) He would have protected Japan
- D) He would have signed a treaty with Japan

ANALYZE: Which person would agree with the following statement? "The Treaty of Versailles was a bad idea."

- A) Franklin Roosevelt
- B) Anne Frank
- C) Adolf Hitler
- D) Winston Churchill

EVALUATE: Which statement is an accurate summary of Hitler's views?

- A) The German military was responsible for Germany's depression
- B) Some German religious groups were responsible for Germany's depression
- C) All German people were responsible for Germany's depression
- D) The German government was responsible for Germany's depression

APPLY: Based on what you know about Hitler, how would he try to defeat the United States?

- A) He would use a propaganda strategy
- B) He would use a fascist strategy
- C) He would use an economic strategy
- D) He would use a blitzkrieg strategy

ANALYZE: Which person would agree with the following statement? "Building a powerful country is very important, regardless of the cost."

- A) Adolf Hitler
- B) Franklin Roosevelt
- C) Haile Selassie
- D) Winston Churchill

EVALUATE: Which statement is an accurate summary of Hitler's views?

- A) In order to build a master race, Germany must expand its empire
- B) In order to build a master race, Germany must make more money
- C) In order to build a master race, Germany must protect only German people

D) In order to build a master race, Germany must increase the number of jobs

APPLY: Based on what you know about Hitler, how would he have reacted if he was alive when Germany surrendered?

- A) He would have refused to surrender
- B) He would have been glad to surrender
- C) He would have been sad to surrender
- D) He would have agreed to surrender

ANALYZE: Which person would agree with the following statement? "Loyalty to one's country is more important than any other type of loyalty."

- A) Franklin Roosevelt
- B) Haile Selassie
- C) Winston Churchill
- D) Adolf Hitler

EVALUATE: Which statement is an accurate summary of Hitler's views?

- A) By invading the Soviet Union, Germany can create a master race
- B) By invading the Soviet Union, Germany can expand its empire
- C) By invading the Soviet Union, Germany can increase food production
- D) By invading the Soviet Union, Germany can strengthen its military